ST/LEG/SER.E/26

MULTILATERAL TREATIES DEPOSITED WITH THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Status as at 1 April 2009

Volume I
Part I, Chapters I to VII

UNITED NATIONS

MULTILATERAL TREATIES DEPOSITED WITH THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Status as at 1 April 2009

Volume I
Part I, Chapters I to VII

UNITED NATIONS
New York, 2009

ST/LEG/SER.E/26

UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATION
Sales No. E.09.V.3

ISBN 978-92-1-133662-7

ISSN 0082-8319

Copyright © 2009 by the United Nations.
All rights reserved.
Printed in the United States of America. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form by any means, i.e., electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior written permission of the United Nations.

INTRODUCTION

1. This publication, the twenty-sixth of the series Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary-General (ST/LEG/ SER/E/ - a supplement to the second volume was issued to cover actions from 1 January to 31 December 1983 under reference ST/LEG/SER.E/22/add.1), consolidates all information on treaty actions (i.e.,signatures, ratifications, accessions, denunciations, miscellaneous notifications, reservations, declarations and objections) undertaken relating to the multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General covered up to 1 April 2009

A. TREATIES COVERED BY THIS PUBLICATION

2. This publication contains:

- All multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General;
- The Charter of the United Nations, in respect of which certain depositary functions have been conferred upon the Secretary-General (although the Charter itself is deposited with the Government of the United States of America);
- Multilateral treaties formerly deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, to the extent that formalities or decisions affecting them have been taken within the framework of the United Nations;[1]
- Certain pre-United Nations treaties, other than those formerly deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, which were amended by protocols adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

B. DIVISION INTO PARTS AND CHAPTERS

3. The publication is comprised of two volumes, and is divided into two parts. Volume I includes Part I, Chapters I to XI. Volume II includes Part I, Chapters XII to XXIX, and Part II. Part I contains information relating to United Nations treaties,[2]and Part II contains information relating to League of Nations treaties. Part I, in turn, is divided into chapters and each chapter relates to a given theme. The treaties within each chapter are listed in the chronological order of their conclusion. Part II lists the first 26 treaties in the order in which they appear in the last League of Nations publication of signatures, ratifications and accessions.[3] Thereafter, the treaties are listed in the order in which they first gave rise to formalities or decisions within the framework of the United Nations.

C. INFORMATION PROVIDED IN RESPECT OF EACH TREATY

(a) United Nations treaties

4. Chapter headers

The following information is typically provided for each treaty in the header of each chapter:

- The full title, place and date of adoption or conclusion;
- Entry into force;
- Registration date and number, pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter (where appropriate);
- The number of signatories and parties;
- References to the text of the treaty as published in the United Nations, Treaty Series (UNTS) or, if it has not yet been published in the Treaty Series, the reference to the United Nations documentation where its text may be found; and
- A brief note on the adoption of the treaty.

5. Status tables

Participants are listed in the status tables in alphabetical order. Against each participant's name, the relevant treaty action is entered, i.e., the date of signature, the date of deposit of the instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval, accession, or succession.[4] The names of participants that have denounced the treaty appear between brackets, and the date of deposit of the notification of denunciation is indicated in a footnote. Additional information on denunciation of treaties appears in footnotes.

Entries in status tables pertaining to formalities effected by a predecessorState in respect of treaties to which the successor States have notified their succession are replaced by the names of the relevant successor States with the corresponding date of deposit of the notification of succession. A footnote indicates the date and type of formality effected by the predecessorState, the corresponding indicator being inserted next to the successor States in the table as the case may be. As regards treaties in respect of which formalities were effected by a predecessor State and not listed in the notifications of succession of the successor States, a footnote indicating the date and type of formality effected by the predecessor State is included in the status of the treaties concerned, the corresponding footnote indicator appearing next to the heading "Participant".

Treaties which have been terminated are denoted by an asterisk. For those treaties, the particpant tables have been removed.

6. Declarations, reservations, objections

The texts of declarations and reservations generally appear in full immediately following the status tables. Objections, territorial applications and communications of a special nature, for example, declarations recognizing the competence of committees such as the Human Rights Committee, also appear in full. Related communications, for example, communications with regard to objections, and other information appear in footnotes.

(b) League of Nations treaties

7. The information provided is essentially based on the official records of the League of Nations. This accounts for the difference in format as compared with treaties deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

8. The list of signatures, ratifications, acceptances, approvals, accessions, and successions in respect of each of the League of Nations multilateral treaties covered by this publication is divided into two sections. The first section reflects the status as at the time of the transfer of those treaties to the custody of the United Nations, without implying a judgement by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the current legal effect of those actions. The second section provides the status following the assumption of the depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations in relation to these treaties.

D. INFORMATION OF A GENERAL NATURE

9. On the occasion of undertaking treaty formalities, issues of a general character are sometimes raised (mostly with regard to representation, succession or territorial application). An effort has been made to group all explanatory notes relevant to such issues as they pertain to the States concerned in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this publication as well as in chapters I.1 and I.2. Similarly, Part I, Chapters I.1 and I.2 contain information transmitted by communications from Heads of States or Governments or Ministers for Foreign Affairs informing the Secretary-General of changes in the official denomination of States or territories. In the case of States that are not members of the United Nations or in the case of intergovernmental organizations, the information appears in notes corresponding to the formalities that gave rise to the issue. Cross-references are provided as required. Progressively, all information of a historical and political nature will be moved to the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of the publication.

Disclaimer:

The Treaty Section, Office of Legal Affairs, United Nations has made every reasonable attempt to ensure that material contained in this publication was correct at the time it was created and last modified. However, this information is provided for reference purposes only. For an official record of actions undertaken with respect to the multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General, States parties are advised to consult the e-mail transmissions/hard copies of the relevant communications issued by the Treaty Section, Office of Legal Affairs, United Nations.

Suggestions for corrections or modifications should be communicated to:

Office of Legal Affairs
Treaty Section
United Nations
New York, N.Y. 10017
United States of America
e-mail: depositaryCN@un.org
Fax: (212) 963-3693

For the regularly updated electronic version of this publication, please visit the United Nations Treaty Collection on the Internet at:

http://treaties.un.org

Notes:

[1] Multilateral treaties formerly deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, by virtue of General Assembly resolution 24 (I) of 12 February 1946, and of a League of Nations Assembly resolution of 18 April 1946 (League of Nations, Official Journal, Special Supplement No. 194, p. 57) were transferred, upon dissolution of the League of Nations, to the custody of the United Nations.

[2] For ease of reference, those League of Nations treaties and other pre-United Nations treaties that were amended by protocols adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations are included in Part I, so that the list of States which have become parties to the amending protocol and to the treaty, as amended, are followed immediately by a list showing the status of the treaty at the time of its transfer to the custody of the United Nations.

[3] See League of Nations, Official Journal, Special Supplement No.195, Supplement to the Twenty-First List, Geneva, 1946.

[4] The following main symbols are used: a, accession; A, acceptance; AA, approval; c, formal confirmation; d, succession; P, participation; s, definitive signature; and n, notification (of provisional application, of special undertaking, etc.). Unless otherwise indicated the date of effect is determined by the relevant provisions of the treaty concerned.

HISTORICAL INFORMATION

ARUBA

See note 1 under "Netherlands" .

BELARUS

Note 1.

Formerly: "Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic" until 18 September 1991.

BENIN

Note 1.

Formerly: "Dahomey" until 2 December 1975.

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Note 1.

The Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina deposited with the Secretary-General notifications of succession to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to various treaties with effect from 6 March 1992, the date on which Bosnia and Herzegovina assumed responsibility for its international relations.

See also note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" .

For information on the treatment of treaty actions by predecessor States and successor States in the status tables, see Part C, "Status tables" of the "Introduction" to this publication.

BURKINA FASO

Note 1.

Formerly: "Upper Volta" until 4 August 1984.

BURMA

See note 1 under "Myanmar" .

CAMBODIA

Note 1.

As from 3 February 1990, "Cambodia". Formerly, as follows: as from 6 April 1976 to 3 February 1990 "Democratic Kampuchea"; as from 30 April 1975 to 6 April 1976 "Cambodia"; as from 28 December 1970 to 30 April 1975 "Khmer Republic".

CAMEROON

Note 1.

As from 4 February 1984 Cameroon (from 10 March 1975 to 4 February 1984 known as "the United Republic of Cameroon" and prior to 10 March 1975 known as "Cameroon".

CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Note 1.

In a communication dated 20 December 1976, the Permanent Mission of the Central African Empire to the United Nations informed the Secretary-General that, by a decision of the extraordinary Congress of the Movement for the Social Development of Black Africa (MESAN), held at Bangui from 10 November to 4 December 1976, the Central African Republic had been constituted into the Central African Empire.

In a communication dated 25 September 1979, the Permanent Representative of that country to the United Nations informed the Secretary-General that, following a change of regime which took place on 20 September 1979, the former institutions of the Empire had been dissolved and the Central African Republic had been proclaimed.

CHINA

Note 1.

Signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China.

China is an original Member of the United Nations, the Charter having been signed and ratified on its behalf, on 26 June and 28 September 1945, respectively, by the Government of the Republic of China, which continued to represent China in the United Nations until 25 October 1971.

On 25 October 1971, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted its resolution 2758 (XXVI), reading as follows:

"The General Assembly.

" *Recalling* the principles of the Charter of the United Nations,

" *Considering* that the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China is essential both for the protection of the Charter of the United Nations and for the cause that the United Nations must serve under the Charter,

" *Recognizing* that the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China are the only lawful representatives of China to the United Nations and that the People's Republic of China is one of the five permanent members of the Security Council,

" *Decides* to restore all its rights to the People's Republic of China and to recognize the representatives of its Government as the only legitimate representatives of China to the United Nations, and to expel forthwith the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek from the place which they unlawfully occupy at the United Nations and in all the organizations related to it."

The United Nations had been notified on 18 November 1949 of the formation, on 1 October 1949, of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. Proposals to effect a change in the representation of China in the United Nations subsequent to that time were not approved until the resolution quoted above was adopted.

On 29 September 1972, a communication was received by the Secretary-General from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China stating:

"l. With regard to theultilateral treaties signed, ratified or acceded to by the defunct Chinese government before the establishment of the Government of the People's Republic of China, my Government will examine their contents before making a decision in the light of the circumstances as to whether or not they should be recognized.

"2. As from October 1, 1949, the day of the founding of the People's Republic of China, the Chiang Kai-shek clique has no right at all to represent China. Its signature and ratification of, or accession to, any multilateral treaties by usurping the name of `China' are all illegal and null and void. My Government will study these multilateral treaties before making a decision in the light of the circumstances as to whether or not they should be acceded to."

All entries recorded throughout this publication in respect of China refer to actions taken by the authorities representing China in the United Nations at the time of those actions.

Note 2.

By a notification on 20 June 1997, the Government of China informed the Secretary-General of the status of Hong Kong in relation to treaties deposited with the Secretary-General. The notification, in pertinent part, reads as follows:

"In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong, signed on 19 December 1984 (hereinafter referred to as the Joint Declaration), the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong with effect from 1 July 1997. Hong Kong will, with effect from that date, become a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China. [For the full text of the Joint Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong, 19 December 1984, see United Nation *Treaty Series* volume No.1399, p. 61, (registration number I-23391)].

It is provided in Section 1 of Annex I to the Joint Declaration, "Elaboration by the Government of the People's Republic of China of its Basic Policies Regarding Hong Kong" and in Articles 12, 13 and 14 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, which was adopted on 4 April 1990 by the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China (hereinafter referred to as the Basic Law), that the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region will enjoy a high degree of autonomy, except in foreign and defence affairs which are the responsibility of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. Furthermore, it is provided both in Section XI of Annex I to the Joint Declaration and Article 153 of the Basic Law that international agreements to which the People's Republic of China is not a party but which are implemented in Hong Kong may continue to be implemented in the Hong Kong Administrative Region.

In this connection, on behalf of the Government of the People's Republic of China, I would like to inform Your Excellency as follows:

I. The treaties listed in Annex I to this Note [herein under], to w hich the People's Republic of China is a party, will be applied to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region with effect from 1 July 1997 as they:

(i) are applied to Hong Kong before 1 July 1997; or (ii) fall within the category of foreign affairs or defence or, owing to their nature and provisions, must apply to the entire territory of a State; or

(iii) are not applied to Hong Kong before 1 July 1997 but with respect to which it has been decided to apply them to Hong Kong with effect from that date (denoted by an asterisk in Annex I). II. The treaties listed in Annex II to this Note [herein under], to which the People's Republic of China is not yet a party and which apply to Hong Kong before 1 July 1997, will continue to apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region with effect from 1 July 1997.

The provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights as applied to Hong Kong shall remain in force beginning from 1 July 1997.

III. The Government of the People's Republic of China has already carried out separately the formalities required for the application of the treaties listed in the aforesaid Annexes, including all the related amendments, protocols, reservations and declarations, to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region with effect from 1 July 1997.

IV. With respect to any other treaty not listed in the Annexes to this Note, to which the People's Republic of China is or will become a party, in the event that it is decided to apply such treaty to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, the Government of the People's Republic of China will carry out separately the formalities for such application. For the avoidance of doubt, no separate formalities will need to be carried out by the Government of the People's Republic of China with respect to treaties which fall within in the category of foreign affairs or defence or which, owing to their nature and provisions, must apply to the entire territory of a State."

The treaties listed in Annexes I and II, referred to in the notification, are reproduced below.

Information regarding reservations and/or declarations made by China with respect to the application of treaties to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region can be found in the footnotes to the treaties concerned as published herein. Footnote indicators are placed against China's entry in the status list of those treaties.

Moreover, with regard to treaty actions undertaken by China after 1 July 1997, the Chinese Government confirmed that the territorial scope of each treaty action would be specified. As such, declarations concerning the territorial scope of the relevant treaties with regard to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region can be found in the footnotes to the treaties concerned as published herein. Footnote indicators are placed against China's entry in the status list of those treaties.

Annex I

(The treaties are listed in the order that they published in these volumes.)

Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice :

- Charter of the United Nations, 26 June 1945; - Statute of the International Court of Justice, 26 June 1945;
- Amendment to Article 61 of the Charter of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 2847 (XXVI) of 20 December 1971.

Privileges and Immunities, Diplomatic and Consular Relations :

- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, 13 February 1946;
- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialised Agencies of the United Nations, 21 November 1947; - Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 18 April 1961;
- Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, 24 April 1963.

Human Rights:

- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 9 December 1948;
- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 7 March 1966;
- Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, 18 December 1979;
- Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, 10 December 1984;
- Convention on the Rights of the Child, 20 November 1989.

Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances :

- Convention on psychotropic substances, 21 February 1971;
- Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, 8 August 1975;
- United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, 20 December 1988.

Health :

- Constitution of the World Health Organization, 22 July 1946.

International Trade and Development :

- Agreement establishing the Asian Development Bank, 4 December 1965;
- Charter of the Asian and Pacific Development Centre, 1 April 1982

Transport and Communications - Customs matters:

- Customs Convention on Containers, 2 December 1972*.

Navigation :

- Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 6 March 1948;
- Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences, 6 April 1974.

Educational and Cultural Matters:

- Convention for the Protection of Products of Phonograms Against Unauthorized Duplication of their Phonograms, 29 October 1971.

Penal Matters :

- International Convention against the taking of hostages, 17 December 1979;
- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, 14 December 1973.

Law of the Sea:

- United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, 10December 1982.

Commercial Arbitration:

- Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, 10 June 1958.

Outer Space:

- Convention on the Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space, 12 November 1974.

Telecommunications :

- Constitution of the Asia-Pacific Telecommunity, 27 March 1976.

Disarmament :

- Convention on Prohibitions or restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects (with protocols I, II and III), 10 October 1980;
- Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction, 3 September 1992.

Environment :

- Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, 22 March 1985;
- Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, 16 September 1987;
- Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, 29 June 1990;
- Basenvention on the Control of Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, 22 March 1989.

Annex II *(The treaties are listed in the order that they are published in these volumes.)*

Refugees and Stateless Persons:

- Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, 28 September 1954.

Traffic in Persons :

- International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, 30 September 1921;
- Protocol amending the International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 18 May 1904, and the International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910, 4 May 1949;
- International Agreement for the Suppression of the "White Slave Traffic", 18 May 1904;
- International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, 4 May 1910.

Obscene Publications:

- Protocol to amend the Convention for the suppression of the circulation of, and traffic in, obscene publications, concluded at Geneva on 12 September 1923, 12 November 1947;
- International Convention for the Suppression of the Circulation of, and Traffic in Obscene Publications, 12 September 1923;
- Protocol amending the Agreement for the Suppression of the Circulation of Obscene Publications, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910, 4 May 1949;
- Agreement for the Repression of Obscene Publications, 4 May 1910.

Transport and Communications - Custom matters:

- International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Materials, 7 November 1952;
- Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, 4 June 1954;
- Additional Protocol to the Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, relating to the Importation of Tourist Publicity Documents and Material, 4 June 1954;
- Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles, 4 June 1954;
- Customs Convention on the Temporary Importati of Commercial Road Vehicles, 18 May 1956;
- Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation for Private Use of Aircraft and Pleasure Boats, 18 May 1956;
- European Convention on Customs Treatment of Pallets Used in International Transport, 9 December 1960.

Transport and Communications - Road Traffic :

- Convention on Road Traffic, 19 September 1949.

Educational and Cultural Matters

- Agreement of the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural materials, 22 November 1950.

Status of Women

- Convention on the Political Rights of Women, 31 March 1953;
- Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages, 10 December 1962.

Penal Matters :

- Protocol amending the Slavery Convention signed at Geneva 25 September 1926, 7 December 1953;
- Slavery Convention, 25 September 1926;
- Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, 7 September 1956.

Environment :

- Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, Copenhagen, 25 November 1992.

League of Nations:

- Convention and Statute on Freedom of Transit, 20 April 1921;
- Convention and Statute on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern, 20 April 1921;
- Declaration Recognizing the Right to a Flag of States Having no Sea-coast, 20 April 1921;
- Convention and Statute on the International Regime of Maritime Ports, 9 December 1923 ;
- International Convention relating to the Simplification of Customs Formalities, 3 November 1923.

See also note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" .

Note 3.

By a notification dated 13 December 1999, the Government of the People's Republic of China informed the Secretary-General of the status of Macao in relation to treaties deposited with the Secretary-General. The notification, in pertinent part, reads as follows:

"In accordawith the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Republic of Portugal on the Question of Macao signed on 13 April 1987 (hereinafter referred to as the Joint Declaration), the Government of the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macao with effect from 20 December 1999. Macao will from that date, become a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China. [For the full text of the Joint Declaration of the Government of the Portuguese Republic and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Macao, 13 April 1987, see United Nation *Treaty Series* volume No. 1498, p. 229 (registration number I-25805)].

It is provided in Section 1 of Elaboration by the Government of the People's Republic of China of its Basic Policies Regarding Macao, which is Annex 1 to the Joint Declaration, and in Article 12, 13 and 14 of the Basic Law of the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China (hereinafter referred to as the Basic Law), which was adopted by the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China on 31 March 1993, that the Macao Special Administrative Region will enjoy a high degree of autonomy, except in foreign and defence affairs which are the responsibilities of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. Furthermore, it is provided both in Section VIII of Annex 1 of the Joint Declaration and Article 138 of the Basic Law that international agreements to which the People's Republic of China is not yet a party but which are implemented in Macao may continue to be implemented in the Macao Special Administrative Region.

In this connection, on behalf of the Government of the People's Republic of China, I have the honour to inform your Excellency that:

I. The treaties listed in Annex I to this Note [herein below], to which the People's Republic of China is a Party, will be applied to te Macao Special Administrative Region with effect from 20 December 1999 so long as they are one of the following categories:

(i) Treaties that apply to Macao before 20 December 1999;

(ii) Treaties that must apply to the entire territory of a state as they concern foreign affairs or defence or their nature or provision so require.

II. The Treaties listed in Annex II to this Note, to which the People's Republic of China is not yet a Party and which apply to Macao before 20 December 1999, will continue to apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region with the effect from 20 December 1999.

III. The Government of the People's Republic of China has notified the treaty depositaries concerned of the application of the treaties including their amendments and protocols listed in the aforesaid Annexes as well as reservations and declarations made thereto by the Chinese Government to the Macao Special Administrative Region with effect from 20 December 1999.

IV. With respect to other treaties that are not listed in the Annexes to this Note, to which the People's Republic of China is or will become a Party, the Government of the People's Republic of China will go through separately the necessary formalities for their application to the Macao Special Administrative Region if it so decided."

The treaties listed in Annexes I and II, referred to in the notification, are reproduced below.

Information regarding reservations and/or declarations made by China with respect to the application of treaties to the Macao Special Administrative Region can be found in the footnotes to the treaties concerned as published herein. Footnote indicators are placed against China's entry in the status list of those treaties.

Moreover, with regard to treaty actions undertaken by China after 13 December 1999, the Chinese Government confirmed that the territorial scope of each treaty action would be specified. As such, declarations concerning the territorial scope of the relevant treaties with regard to the Macao Special Administrative Region can be found in the footnotes to the treaties concerned as published herein. Footnote indicators are placed against China's entry in the status list of those treaties.

Annex I

(The treaties appear in the order as they are provided in these volumes.)

Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice :

- Charter of the United Nations, 26 June 1945;
- Statute of the International Court of Justice, 26 June 1945;
- Amendment to Article 61 of the Charter of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 2847 (XXVI) of 20 December 1971.

Privileges and Immunities, Diplomatic and Consular Relations:

- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, 13 February 1946;
- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialised Agencies of the United Nations, 21 November 1947;
- Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 18 April 1961;
- Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, 24 April 1963.

Human Rights :

- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 7 March 1966;
- Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, 18 December 1979;
- Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, 10 December 1984;
- Convention on the Rights of the Child, 20 November 1989.

Refugees and Stateless Persons:

- Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, 28 July 1951;
- Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees, 31 January 1967;

Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances:

- Convention on psychotropic substances, 21 February 1971;
- United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, 20 December 1988.

Health :

- Constitution of the World Health Organization, 22 July 1946.

International Trade and Development :

- Charter of the Asian and Pacific Development Centre, 1 April 1982.

Navigation:

- Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 6 March 1948.

Penal Matters:

- International Convention against the taking of hostages, 17 December 1979; -

Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, 14 December 1973.

Law of the Sea:

- United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, 10 December 1982.

Law of Treaties :

- Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, 23 May 1969.

Telecommunications:

- Constitution of the Asia-Pacific Telecommunity, 27 March 1976.

Disarmament :

- Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects (with Protocols I, II and III), 10 October 1980;
- Additional Protocol to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects (Protocol IV, entitled Protocol on Blinding Laser Weapons), 13 October 1995;
- Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices as amended on 3 May 1996 (Protocol II as amended on 3 May 1996) annexed to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects, 3 May 1996;
- Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction, 3 September 1992.

Environment:

- Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, 22 March 1985;
- Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, 16 September 1987;
- Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, 29 June 1990;
- Basel Convention on thetrol of Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, 22 March 1989;
- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, 9 May 1992;
- Convention on biological diversity, 5 June 1992.

Annex II :

(The treaties appear in the order as they are provided in these volumes.)

Human Rights :

- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 16 December 1966;
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 16 December 1966;

Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances :

- Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 30 March 1961
- Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs and Narcotic Substances, 25 March 1972.

Traffic in Persons:

- International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, 30 September 1921;
- International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age, 11 October 1933;
- Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others, 21 March 1950;

Transport and Communication - customs matters :

- Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, 4 June 1954;
- Additional Protocol to the Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, relating to the Importation of Tourist Publicity Documents and Material, 4 June 1954;

Transport and Communication - road traffic :

- Convention on Road Traffic, 19 September 1949.

Penal Matters :

- Slavery Convention, 25 September 1926;
- Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, 7 September 1956;

League of Nations :

- Convention for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, 7 June1930;
- Convention for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in connection with Cheques, 19 March 1931;
- Convention providing a Uniform Law for Bills of Exchange and Prmissory Notes, 7 June 1930;
- Convention providing a Uniform Law for Cheques, 19 March 1931;
- Convention on the Stamp Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, 7 June 1930;
- Convention on the Stamps Laws in connection with Cheques, 19 March 1931.

See also note 1 under "Macao" and note 1 under"Portugal" .

CONGO

Note 1.

In a communication dated 15 November 1971, the Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of the Congo to the United Nations informed the Secretary-General that their country would henceforth be known as the "Congo".

COOK ISLANDS

Note 1.

Formerly administered by New Zealand, the Cook Islands and Niue currently have the status of self-governing States in free association with New Zealand.

The responsibility of the Cook Islands and Niue to conduct their own international relations and particularly to conclude treaties has evolved substantially over the years. For a period of time it was considered that, in view of the fact that the Cook Island and Niue, though self-governing, had entered into special relationships with New Zealand, which discharged the responsibilities for the external relations and defence of the Cook Islands and Niue at their request, it followed that the Cook Islands and Niue did not have their own treaty making capacity.

However, in 1984, an application by the Cook Islands for membership in the World Health Organization was approved by the World Health Assembly in accordance with its article 6, and the Cook Islands, in accordance with article 79, became a member upon deposit of an instrument of acceptance with the Secretary-General. In the circumstances, the Secretary-General felt that the question of the status, as a State, of the Cook Islands, had been duly decided in the affirmative by the World Heath Assembly, whose membership was fully respresentative of the international community.

On the basis of the Cook Islands' membership in the World Health Organization, and of its subsequent admittance to other specialized agencies (Food and Agriculture Organization in 1985, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in 1985 and the International Civil Aviation Organization in 1986) as a full member without any specifications or limitations, the Secretary-General considered that the Cook Islands could participate in a treaty in its own right as a State. Consequently, the Cook Islands signed the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention on Biological Diversity in 1992.

The same solution was adopted by the SecretarGeneral following the approval of Niue's application for membership in the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization UNESCO in 1993 and of the World Health Organization in 1994.

As a result of these developments, the Secretary-General, as depositary of multilateral treaties, recognized the full treaty-making capacity of the Cook Islands in 1992 and of Niue in 1994.

COSTA RICA

Note 1.

On 9 January 2002, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Costa Rica a communication transmitting the formal objection to the reservation formulated by the Government of Nicaragua which reads as follows:

I have the honour to write to you in your capacity as depositary of the declarations provided for in Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, with reference to note MRE/DW1081/10/01, which the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nicaragua transmitted to you on 24 October 2001.

On 24 September 1929, the Republic of Nicaragua recognized, unconditionally, the compulsory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice. That declaration was deemed transferable to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice by virtue of Article 36, paragraph 5, of the Statute of the Court. On various occasions, Nicaragua has used this optional declaration to bring proceedings before the International Court of Justice. In the *Military and Paramilitary Activities In and Against Nicaragua* case between Nicaragua and the United States of America, the Court found that this declaration was valid.

The above-mentioned note from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nicaragua, dated 24 October 2001, represents a casuistic attempt by the Nicaraguan Government to modify its voluntary declaration of unconditional acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice as follows:

"Nicaragua will not accept as from 1 November 2001 the jurisdiction or competence of the International Court of Justice in relation to any matter or claim based on interpretations of treaties or arbitral awards that were signed and ratified or made, respectively, prior to 31 December 1901."

The Government of Costa Rica considers that this purported "reservation" is not permissible for the following reasons: (1) Public international law does not recognize the right to formulate reservations a posteriori unconditional declarations of acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice; (2) Nicaragua is unable to formulate this "reservation" by virtue of its unilateral declarations before the same Court with respect to the nature of its acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction and the possibility of modifying it; (3) Even if this reservation were permissible, which it is not, the lack of a reasonable time period for its entry into force renders such a "reservation" contrary to the principle of good faith in international relations. In addition, it is worth noting that the foregoing is supported by the provision of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties contained in article 2, paragraph 1 (d), on the meaning of a reservation. Moreover, the provision contained in article 20, paragraph 3, of that Convention should also be borne in mind with respect to the formulation of a reservation to a treaty which is a constituent instrument of an international organization.

I must point out that the note to which my Government objects was not transmitted spontaneously. Rather, it represents a reaction to the fact that my Government has included an item in the national budget to cover the cost of the possible filing of a claim by Costa Rica against Nicaragua before the International Court of Justice for its failure to abide by the provisions agreed upon by both countries in the Cailas-Jerez Treaty of 1858 and the Cleveland Award of 1888. Both instruments were signed and ratified during the period which Nicaragua now seeks to exclude from the Court's jurisdiction by means of the above-mentioned reservation. However, in its haste, it has overlooked the fact that, on 21 February 1949, the Government of Nicaragua signed a Pact of Amity with Costa Rica. Article III of that instrument reflects the commitment to apply the American Treaty on Pacific Settlement. Nicaragua has also failed to consider that, on 9 January 1956, as a corollary to the 1949 Pact of Amity, Nicaragua and Costa Rica signed, at the Pan American Union in Washington, an agreement to facilitate and expedite traffic on the San Juan River within the terms of the Treaty of 15 April 1858 and its interpretation given by arbitration on 22 March 1888. Both instruments were ratified in due course by both countries. The purported reservation also fails to include the judgement pronounced on 20 September 1916 by the Central American Court of Justice. The 1916 judgement of the Central American Court of Justice, the 1949 Pact of Amity and the 1956 agreement reinforce a set of legal rules which must be respected.

1. International law does not give Nicaragua the right to formulate reservations a posteriori to its unconditional declaration of acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

In the judgement on the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice pronounced in the *Military and Paramilitary Activities In and Against Nicaragua* case, the Court indicated that States could not modify their acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction as they pleased, but were bound by the terms of their declarations.

The Court noted, in particular, that the right to terminate declarations with indefinite duration was far from established in international law.

Nicaragua itself has recognized that contemporary international law does not give States the power to modify unilaterally their optional declarations of acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice when such declarations are unconditional.

In its written pleadings in the *Border and Transborder Armed Actions* case between Nicaragua and Honduras, Nicaragua stated categorically that a State bound by an optional declaration could not modify or denounce that declaration. Nicaragua claimed that the declaring State was bound by the terms of the optional declaration and that, by virtue of the principle of good faith, it could not seek to disengage unilatrally from the obligations it had acquired in making that declaration.

Nicaragua argued that that rule arose from an analogous application of the customary principles of the law of treaties. Nicaragua indicated that the principles incorporated into the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties were applicable to voluntary declarations of acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction in respect of denunciation and reservation, meaning that such declarations could not be modified unless the declaring State had previously reserved that right. Lastly, Nicaragua maintained that State practice showed that a State could modify an optional declaration only when it reserved the right to do so at the time it made the original declaration.

In its written pleadings in the jurisdictional phase of the *Military and Paramilitary Activities* case, Nicaragua argued that the legality of a purported modification depended on the intention of the declaring State at the time of making the original optional declaration. If the declaring State did not expressly reserve the right to make modifications, that State did not have the power to change its declaration or to formulate reservations.

Insofar as the declaration of acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice made by Nicaragua in 1929 does not include any conditions or time limits, nor does it expressly reserve the right to modify its content, Nicaragua has no right to formulate reservations to its acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction.

2. Nicaragua, by virtue of its public unilateral declarations before the Court with respect to the nature of its optional declaration and the possibility of modifying it, cannot formulate any reservations.

In a number of unilateral declarations, Nicaragua has recognized that its own declaration of acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction cannot be modified in any way.

In its written pleadings in the *Military and Paramilitary Activities* case, Nicaragua pointed out that its 1924 declaration could not be terminated or modified without prior notice and that any withdrawal or modification of the declaration must be based on the principles of the law of treaties. What is more, Nicaragua indicated categorically that the assumption that its declaration could be modified without prior notice was unfounded in the law relating to consensual legal obligations arising from optional declarations. In the same case, Nicaragua argued against the possibility of unilaterally modifying declarations of acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction. Nicaragua based its arguments both on the writings of the most distinguished legal experts and on considerations of principle. Nicaragua noted that the existence of a universal right of unilateral modification of optional declarations would violate the system of optional clauses in the Statute and would essentially eliminate the compulsory nature ofthe Court's jurisdiction.

These arguments demonstrate both Nicaragua's intention that its 1929 declaration of acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction should not be subject to any modification or denunciation and its repeated contention that the unilateral modification of such declarations, in the absence of a previous reservation, is contrary to international law. This acknowledgement of the legal situation is binding on Nicaragua. Under the principles of estoppel and good faith, Nicaragua cannot, at this time, reverse those positions.

Accordingly, Costa Rica considers that Nicaragua cannot now claim to modify unilaterally its unconditional acceptance of the voluntary jurisdiction of the Court by means of a purported "reservation".

Even if Nicaragua had the right to formulate a reservation to its optional declaration, which it does not, the lack of a reasonable time period for its entry into force renders such a "reservation" null and void.

In the *Military and Paramilitary Activities* case, the International Court of Justice indicated that, while the right to denounce declarations without limit of time was far from established in international law, if such a right existed, then any denunciation would, by analogy with the law of treaties, have to provide for a reasonable time period before it entered into force. This principle applies, by analogy, to the introduction of changes to the voluntary acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction. Consequently, even if Nicaragua could modify its optional declaration by means of a reservation, which is not the case, then such a modification would have to be subject to a reasonable time period, by virtue of the principle of good faith.

It should be noted that, in the *Border and Transborder Armed Actions* case, Nicaragua argued that only a period of at least 12 months could be considered reasonable for any modification of a declaration of voluntary acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction.

Nicaragua's purported "reservation", which my Government has analysed in this note, provides for a period of only eight days from the time of its signature by the President of Nicaragua to the time of its purported entry into force. Even if Nicaragua were legally in a position to modify its acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction, which it is not, a period of eight days would not meet the requirement of a reasonable time period for the entry into force of such a modification.

What is more, Nicaragua, by virtue of its declarations in the *Border and Transborder Armed Actions* case, would be obligated, under the principles of good faith and estoppel, to provide for a period of at least 12 months before the purported "reservation" could enter into force. Accordingly, the purported "reservation" formulated on 24 October 2001 cannot be considered to meet the minimum requirements imposed by the principle of good faith.

Jurisdiction of the Court and the Pact of Bogotá:

Moreover, in the case of Nicaragua, as in the case of anyother Latin American State party to the Pact of Bogotá, the denunciation of the Statute of the Court would not disengage it from the obligation to recognize the competence of that Court as a respondent, for the following reason:

In April 1948, the American Treaty on Pacific Settlement, better known as the Pact of Bogotá, was adopted. Costa Rica ratified it on 27 April 1949, and Nicaragua, in turn, ratified it on 26 July 1950. Accordingly, the Pact of Bogotá has been in force between Costa Rica and Nicaragua as from the latter date.

The Pact contains a definitive declaration of recognition of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court for all disputes of a juridical nature among the States parties to the Pact. Article XXXI of the Pact says:

" 1n conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, the High Contracting Parties declare that they recognize in relation to any other American State, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory *ipso facto* , without the necessity of any special agreement so long as the present Treaty is in force, in all disputes of a juridical nature that arise among them ......"

Therefore, since both Costa Rica and Nicaragua are ratifying parties to the Pact of Bogotá, there can be no doubt that both parties have recognized the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice to settle any legal dispute between them.

The above-mentioned article XXXI has the legal effect of transforming the vague juridical relations arising from unilateral declarations made by the parties under the optional clause into contractual relations which have the force and stability characteristic of an obligation arising directly from a treaty.

Dr. Eduardo Jimenez de Aréchega, a distinguished Uruguayan jurist who had the honour to serve as President of the International Court of Justice, maintained that there were substantial differences between the exercise of the optional clause and the fact ofarty to a convention. In an opinion which he provided to Costa Rica in his capacity as adviser to our country in the 1986 *Nicaragua v. Costa Rica* case, he gave the following explanation:

"The fundamental difference between the recognition of the Court's jurisdiction expressed by the parties to the Pact of Bogotá and that expressed by other States under the optional clause is as follows: (a) once the Pact of Bogotá has been ratified by an American State, the recognition of the Court's jurisdiction may be withdrawn only by denunciation of the Pact itself, which must be effected with at least one year's notice; and (b) the States which ratified the Pact could have introduced reservations to their recognition of the Court's jurisdiction if they had done so at the time of signature. As they did not do so with respect to the recognition of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court, article XXXI became a mechanism for accepting fully the Court's jurisdiction, and is completely different in this regard from the very conditional acceptance which the majority of States have expressed through the application of the optional clause.

'From these substantial differences, it follows that the American States parties to the Pact of Bogotá have established a legal system among themselves whereby the optional clause has been replaced by the categorical declaration contained in article XXXI of the Pact. The declarations made by American States in exercise of their prerogative under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court only have the legal effect of establishing the tenuous relations under that clause exclusively with States which are not Contracting Parties to the Pact of Bogotá, but not the contractual obligation created by article XXXI to recognize, with the force of a treaty, the obligation to grant the American States parties to the Pact of Bogotá the right to bring claims against other American States before the Court at The Hague".

Consequently, evearagua's Presidential Decree revoking the unilateral declaration of 1929 in which Nicaragua recognized the jurisdiction of the Court at The Hague to settle legal disputes with any other State having expressed the same recognition were valid, which it is not, that nation would still be bound to recognize the competence of the Court at The Hague to settle legal disputes with any other Latin American State party to the Pact of Bogotá.

In light of the above, so long as the Pact of Bogotá is in force, Nicaragua cannot deny the competence of the International Court of Justice to hear and settle any legal dispute brought before it by Costa Rica.

For all the foregoing reasons, the Government of Costa Rica hereby presents a formal objection to the "reservation" formulated by the Government of Nicaragua, and declares that, for all intents and purposes, it will consider such reservation to be non-existent.

I should be grateful if you would transmit this document to the secretariat of the International Court of Justice and to the States parties to its Statute. Likewise, I should be grateful if you would have it circulated to the General Assembly as a document of the Assembly under the agenda item relating to the consideration of the report of the International Court of Justice to the General Assembly.

Accept, Sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

(Signed) Roberto Rojas

COTE D'IVOIRE

Note 1.

Formerly: "Ivory Coast" until 31 December 1985.

CROATIA

Note 1.

In a letter dated 27 July 1992, received by the Secretary-General on 4 August 1992 and accompanied by a list of multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General, the Government of the Republic of Croatia notified that:

"[The Government of]…the Republic of Croatia has decided, based on the Constitutional Decision on Sovereignty and Independence of the Republic of Croatia of 25 June, 1991 and the Decision of the Croatian Parliament in respect of the territory of the Republic of Croatia, by virtue of succession of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia of 8 October, 1991, to be considered a party to the conventions that Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and its predecessor states (the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia) were parties, according to the enclosed list.

In conformity with the international practice, [the Government of the Republic of Croatia] would like to suggest that this take effect from 8 October, 1991, the date on which the Republic of Croatia became independent."

See also note 1 under "former Yugoslavia".

For information on the treatment of treaty actions by predecessor States and successor States in the status tables, see Part C, "Status tables" of the "Introduction" to this publication.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and "Slovakia" .

CZECH REPUBLIC

Note 1.

In a letter dated 16 February 1993, received by the Secretary-General on 22 February 1993 and accompanied by a list of multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General, the Government of the Czech Republic notified that :

"In conformity with the valid principles of international law and to the extent defined by it, the Czech Republic, as a successor State to the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, considers itself bound, as of 1 January 1993, i.e., the date of the dissolution of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, by multilateral international treaties to which the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic was a party on that date, including reservations and declarations to their provisions made earlier by the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic.

The Government of the Czech Republic have examined multilateral treaties the list of which is attached to this letter. [The Government of the Czech Republic] considers to be bound by these treaties as well as by all reservations and declarations to them by virtue of succession as of 1 January 1993.

The Czech Republic, in accordance with the well established principles of international law, recognizes signatures made by the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic in respect of all signed treaties as if they were made by itself."

In view of the information above, entries in status lists pertaining to formalities (i.e., signatures, ratifications, accessions, declarations and reservations, etc.) effected by the former Czechoslovakia prior to dissolution, in respect of treaties to which the Czech Republic and/or Slovakia have succeeded, will be replaced by the name of "Czech Republic" and/or "Slovakia" with the corresponding date of deposit of the notification of succession. A footnote will indicate the date and type of formality effected by the former Czechoslovakia, the corresponding indicator being inserted next to "Czech Republic" and "Slovakia" as the case may be.

As regards treaties in respect of which formalies were effected by the former Czechoslovakia and not listed in the notification of succession by either the Czech Republic or Slovakia, a footnote indicating the date and type of formality effected by the former Czechoslovakia will be included in the status of the treaties concerned, the corresponding footnote indicator being inserted next to the heading "Participant".

See also note 1 under "Slovakia" .

For information on the treatment of treaty actions by predecessor States and successor States in the status tables, see Part C, "Status tables" of the "Introduction" to this publication.

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

Note 1.

As from 17 May 1997. Formerly: "Zaire" until 16 May 1997 and "Democratic Republic of the Congo" until 27 October 1971.

DENMARK

Note 1.

In a communication received on 22 July 2003, the Govenrment of Denmark informed the Secretary-General that "... Denmark's ratifications normally include the entire Kingdom of Denmark including the Faroe Islands and Greenland."

EGYPT

See note 1 under "United Arab Republic".

ESTONIA

Note 1.

In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 8 October 1991, the Chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Estonia informed the Secretary-General that "Estonia does not regard itself as party by virtue of the doctrine of treaty succession to any bilateral or multilateral treaties entered into by the U.S.S.R. The Republic of Estonia has begun careful review of multilateral treaties in order to determine those to which it wishes to become a party. In this regard it will act on a case-by-case basis in exercise of its own sovereign right in the name of the Republic of Estonia.".

FAROE ISLANDS

See note 1 under "Denmark" .

GERMANY

Note 1.

1. Prior to the formation of one sovereign German State through the accession of the German Democratic Republic to the Federal Republic of Germany (effective from 3 October 1990), the Secretary-General received numerous communications relating to the application of international instruments to West Berlin.

2. In each case (noted here), the initial communication took the form of a note, letter, or declaration from the Federal Republic of Germany, in, accompanying or in connection with its instrument of accession, acceptance or ratification of an amendment, agreement, convention or protocol, to the effect that the relevant amendment, agreement, convention or protocol would also apply to *"Land Berlin"* or *"Berlin (West)"* (as noted here) with effect from the date on which it entered into force for the Federal Republic of Germany.

- Communication (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of accession (deposited 10 October 1957) to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, 13 February 1946.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of accession (deposited 10 October 1957) to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 21 November 1947.

Note: Acting in accordance with section 43 of article X of the Convention, the Federal Republic of Germany undertook to apply the provisions of the Convention to a number of specialized agencies by participation in each Annex to the Convention relevant to that specialized agency (for complete list of the Annexes participated in by the Federal Republic of Germany, see point 15 at the end of this footnote). Thereby, the declaration noted here, and the series of communications provoked by it recorded in the points below, came to apply to each of these Annexes as well. Therefore, any reference to the Convention and these communications below should therefore be understood as applying to each of these Annexes also.

- Statement (re: *"Land Berlin"*) in the instrument of ratification (deposited 11 November 1964) of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 18 April 1961.

- Statement (re: *"Land Berlin"*) in the instrument of ratification (deposited 11 November 1964) of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, Concerning Acquisition of Nationality, 18 April 1961.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of accession (deposited 24 November 1954) to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 9 December 1948.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 16 May 1969) of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 7 March 1966.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 17 December 1973) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 16 December 1966.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 17 December 1973) of the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights, 16 December 1966.

- Note (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 10 July 1985) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, 18 December 1979.

- Letter (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 1 October 1990) of the Convention Against Torture: and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, 10 December 1984.

- Communication (re: *"Land Berlin"*) (received 15 December 1955) referring to the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, 28 July 1951.

- Letter (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 16 October 1976) of the Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, 28 September 1954.

- Cmmunication (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying The instrument of accession (deposited 31

August 1977) to the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness, 30 August 1961.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of accession (deposited 5 November 1969) to the Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, 13 January 1967.

- Communication (re: *"Land Berlin"*) (received 22 January 1960) in relation to the Protocol Amending the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on Narcotic Drugs, concluded at the Hague on 23 January 1912, at Geneva on 11 February 1925, 19 February 1925 and 13 July 1931, at Bangkok on 27 November 1931 and at Geneva on 26 June 1936.

- Communication (re: *"Land Berlin"*) (received 22 January 1960) in relation to the Protocol Bringing under International Control Drugs Outside the Scope of the Convention of 13 July 1931 for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, as amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946, 19 November 1948.

- Communication (re: *"Land Berlin"*) (received 27 April 1960) in relation to the Protocol for Limiting and Regulating the Cultivation of the Poppy Plant, the Production of, International and Wholesale Trade in, and use of Opium, 23 June 1953.

- Letter (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 3 December 1973) of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, 30 March 1961.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 2 December 1977) of the Convention on Psychotropic substances, 21 February 1971.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 20 February 1975) of the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, 25 March 1972.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of acceptance (deposited 29 May 13) of the Protocol to amend the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, concluded at Geneva on 30 September 1921, and the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age, concluded at Geneva on 11 October 1933, 12 November 1947.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with acceptance (deposited 29 May 1973) of the Protocol amending the International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 18 May 1904, and the International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910, 4 May 1949.

- Communication (re: *"Land Berlin"*) (received 6 October 1964) in relation to the Constitution of the World Health Organization, 22 July 1946.

- Declaration (re: *"Land Berlin"*) with acceptance (deposited 23 December 1971) of the Amendments to articles 24 and 25 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization, 23 May 1967.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with acceptance (deposited 9 July 1975) of the Amendments to articles 34 and 55 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization, 22 May 1973.

- Note (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of acceptance (deposited 16 January 1985) of the Amendments to articles 24 and 25 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization, 17 May 1976.

- Letter (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of acceptance (deposited 15 September 1987) of the Amendments to articles 24 and 25 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization, 12 May 1986.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 14 October 1977) of the Agreement establishing the International Fund for Agricultural Development, 13 June 1976.

- Note (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 13 July 1983) of the Constitution of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, 8 April 1979.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with acceptance (deposited 16 February 1983) of the Agreement establishing the African Development Bank done at Khartoum on 4 August 1963, as amended by resolution 05-79 adopted by the Board of Governors on 17 May 1979, 7 May 1982.

- Note (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 21 December 1989) of the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods, 11 April 1980.

- Communication (re: *"Land Berlin"*) (dated 15 December 1955) in relation to the International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material, 7 November 1952.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 16 September 1957) of the Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, 4 June 1954. The note also stated that the Additional Protocol to the Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, relating to the Importation of Tourist Publicity Documents and Material, 4 June 1954 and the Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles, 4 June 1954, also applied to West Berlin.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 16 September 1957) of the Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles, 4 June 1954.

- Communication (re: *"Land Berlin"*) (received 30 November 1961) in relation to the Customs Convention on Containers, 18 May 1956.

- Communication (re: *"Land Berlin"*) (received 30 November 1961) in relation to the Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Commercial Road Vehicles, 18 May 1956.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 29 September 1964) of the European Convention on Customs Treatment of Pallets used in International Transport, 9 December 1960.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (Wes)"*) with ratification (deposited 20 December 1982) of the Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods under Cover of TIR Carnets (TIR Convention), 14 November 1975.

Letter (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 12 June 1987) of the International Convention on the Harmonization of Frontier Controls of Goods, 21 October 1982.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of accession (deposited 7 July 1961) to the Convention on the Taxation of Road Vehicles for Private Use in International Traffic, 18 May 1956.

- Communication (re: *"Land Berlin"*) (received 7 November 1961) in relation to the Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR), 19 May 1956.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 1 December 1969) o the European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR), 30 September 1957.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with acceptance (deposited 4 March 1980) of Protocol amending article 14 (3) of the European Agreement of 30 September 1957 concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR), 21 August 1975.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 3 January 1963) of the European Agreement on Road Markings, 13 December 1957.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 29 November 1965) of the Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Technical Prescriptions for Wheeled Vehicles, Equipment and Parts which can be Fitted and/or be Used on Wheeled Vehicles and the Conditions for Reciprocal Recognition of Approvals Granted on the Basis of These Prescriptions, 20 March 1958.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 3 August 1978)of the Convention on Road Traffic, 8 Novemb 1968.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 3 August 1978) of the Convention on Road Signals, 8 November 1968.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with ratification (deposited 9 July 1975) of the European Agreement concerning the Work of Crews of Vehicles Engaged in International Road Transport (AETR), 1 July 1970.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification, (deposited 3 August 1978) of the European Agreement Supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals Opened for Signature at Vienna on 8 November 1968, 1 May 1971.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 3 August 1978) of the Protocol on Road Markings, Additional to the European Agreement Supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals Opened for Signature at Vienna on 8 November 1968, 1 March 1973.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) upon ratification (deposited 3 August 1978) of the European Agreement on Main International Arteries, 15 November 1975.

- Letter (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 23 October 1987) of the European Agreement on Main International Railway Lines (AGC), 31 May 1985.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of acceptance (deposited 7 October 1965) of Amendments to articles 17 and 18 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 15 September 1964, and instrument of acceptance (deposited 22 July 1966) of Amendment to article 28 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 28 September 1965, but applying also to the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 6 March 1948.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of acceptance (deposited 7 October 1965) of Amendments to articles 17 and 18 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 15eptember 1964.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of acceptance (deposited 22 July 1966) of Amendment to article 28 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 28 September 1965.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with acceptance (deposited 1 December 1975) of the Amendments to articles 10, 16, 17, 18, 20, 28, 31 and 32 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 17 October 1974.

- Letter (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of acceptance (deposited 24 October 1977) of Amendments to the title and substantive provisions of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 14 November 1975 and 9 November 1977.

- Communication (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of acceptance (deposited 2 April 1979) of the Amendments to the Convention on the International Maritime Organization relating to the institutionalization of the Committee on Technical Co-operation in the Convention, 17 November 1977.

- Letter (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of acceptance (deposited 23 June 1980) of the Amendments to articles 17, 18, 20 and 51 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 15 November 1979.

- Statement (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) in the instrument of ratification (deposited 29 May 1973) of the Convention relating to the unification of certain rules concerning collisions in inland navigation, 15 March 1960.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) upon ratification (deposited 19 April 1974) of the Convention on the measurement of inland navigation vessels, 15 February 1966.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) in connection with ratification (deposited 6 April 1983) of the

Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences, 6 April 1974.

- Communication (re: *"Land Berlin"*) (received 25 September 1957) in relation to the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Culral Materials, 22 November 1950.
- Declaration (re: *"Land Berlin"*) with ratification (deposited 21 July 1966) of the International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organisations, 26 October 1961.
- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with ratification (deposited 7 February 1974) of the Convention for the Protection of Producers of Phonograms against Unauthorized Duplication of their Phonograms, 29 October 1971.
- Letter (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 17 August 1989) of the Protocol to the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials of 22 November 1950, 26 November 1976.
- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of accession (deposited 23 October 1958) to the Protocol for extending the period of validity of the Convention on the Declaration of Death of Missing Persons, 16 January 1957. Also contains statements regarding specific terms of the convention and their extension to Berlin (West).
- Letter (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of accession (deposited 4 November 1970) to the Convention on the Political Rights of Women, 31 March 1953.
- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with instrument of accession (deposited 7 February 1974) to the Convention on the Nationality of Married Women, 20 February 1957.
- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of accession (deposited 9 July 1969) to the Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages, 10 December 1962.
- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with acceptance (deposited 29 May 1973) of the Protocol amending the Slavery Convention signed at Geneva on 25 September 1926, 7 December 1953.
- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 14 January 1959) of the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, 7 September 1956.
- Communication (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 15 December 1980) of the International Convention against the taking of hostages, 17 December 1979.
- Communication (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 25 January 1977) of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, 14 December 1973.
- Statement (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) in the instrument of ratification (deposited 15 August 1985) of the Agreement establishing the Common Fund for Commodities, 27 June 1980.
- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 20 July 1959) of the Convention on the Recovery Abroad of Maintenance, 20 June 1956.
- Statement (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with the instrument of ratification (deposited 26 July 1973) of the Convention on the High Seas, 29 April 1958.
- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with ratification (deposited 26 July 1973) of the Optional Protocol of Signature concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, 29 April 1958.
- Declaration (re: *"Land Berlin"*) with ratification (deposited 30 June 1961) of the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, 10 June 1958.
- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 21 July 1987) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, 23 May 1969. Application expressed as being "subject to the rights and responsibilities of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America".
- Communication (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 16 October 1979) of the Convention on registration of objects launched into outer space, 12 November 1974).
- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (est)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 25 May 1979) of the Convention relating to the distribution of programme-carrying signals transmitted by satellite, 21 May 1974.
- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 24 May 1983) of the Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, 10 December 1976.
- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with ratification (deposited 15 July 1982) of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, 13 November 1979.
- Note (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 3 March 1987) of the Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution on the Reduction of Sulphur Emissions or their Transboundary Fluxes by at least 30 percent, 8 July 1985.

3. In the case of the following amendments, agreements, conventions or protocols, communications from other States were received by the Secretary-General in response to the application of the relevant amendment, agreement, convention or protocol to West Berlin by the Federal Republic of Germany to the effect that the application to West Berlin by the Federal Republic of Germany had no legal validity on the ground that West Berlin was not a "Land" of, or part of the territory of, the Federal Republic of Germany and could not be governed by it.

- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 21 November 1947; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Bulgaria, Mongolia, Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 18 April 1961; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, Concerning Acquisition of Nationality, 18 April 1961; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 7 March 1966; communications from the Governments of Bulgaria (received 16 September 1969), Czechoslovakia (received 3 November 1969), Mongolia (received 7 January 1970), Poland (received 20 June 1969), the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (received 10 November 1969) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 4 August 1969).

- Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, 13 January 1967; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Bulgaria and Mongolia.

- Protocol Amending the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on Narcotic Drugs, concluded at The Hague on 23 January 1912, at Geneva on 11 February 1925, 19 February 1925 and 13 July 1931, at Bangkok on 27 November 1931 and Geneva on 26 June 1936; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Protocol Bringing under International Control Drugs Outside the Scope of the Convention of 13 July 1931 for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, as amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946, 19 November 1948; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Protocol for Limiting and Regulating the Cultivation of the Poppy Plant, the Production of, International and Wholesale Trade in, and use of Opium, 23 June 1953; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Constitution ofthe World Health Organization, 22 July 1946; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Amendments to articles 24 and 25 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization, 23 May 1967; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material, 7 November 1952; note accompanying the instrument of accession of the Government of Romania (deposited 15 November 1968).

- Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, 4 June 1954; Additional Protocol to the Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, relating to the Importation of Tourist Publicity Documents and Material, 4 June 1954; and Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles, 4 June 1954. Communication (no date available) from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles, 4 June 1954. Communication (no date available) from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Customs Convention on Containers, 18 May 1956; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Commercial Road Vehicles, 18 May 1956; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- European Convention on Customs Treatment of Pallets used in International Transport, 9 December 1960; communications (no dates available) from the Governments o Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Convention on the Taxation of Road Vehicles for Private Use in International Traffic, 18 May 1956; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Albania, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR), 19 May 1956; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (reaffirmed in declaration upon accession, deposited 2 September 1983).

- European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR), 30 September 1957; communications from the Governments of Bulgaria (received 13 May 1970) and Mongolia (received 22 June 1970).

- European Agreement on Road Markings, 13 December 1957; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the

Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Technical Prescriptions for Wheeled Vehicles, Equipment and Parts which can be fitted and/or be used on Wheeled Vehicles and the Conditions for Reciprocal Recognition of Approvals Granted on the Basis of These Prescriptions, 20 March 1958; communications from the Governments of Albania (received 14 June 1966), the Byelorussian SSR (received 6 June 1966 and 10 November 1967), Czechoslovakia (received 1 February 1966 and 13 September 1967), Hungary (received 10 February 1966), Poland (received 4 March 1966), the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 12 April 1966 and 2 June 1967, and upon accession, deposited 10 December 1986).
- Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 6arch 1948; communication (no date available) from the Government of Poland.
- Amendments to articles 17 and 18 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 15 September 1964; communication (no date available) from the Government of Poland.
- Amendment to article 28 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 28 September 1965; communication (no date available) from the Government of Poland.
- Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials, 22 November 1950; communication (no date available) from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.
- International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organisations, 26 October 1961; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.
- Convention on the Political Rights of Women, 31 March 1953; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Bulgaria, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.
- Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages, 10 December 1962; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.
- Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, 7 September 1956; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.
- Convention on the Recovery Abroad of Maintenance, 20 June 1956; communication (no dates available) from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.
- Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, 10 June 1958; communications (no dates available) from the Governmenf Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

4. Often communications from other States in response to the application to West Berlin by the Federal Republic of Germany of various amendments, agreements, conventions or protocols, noted at point 3 (as listed here), solicited yet further communications from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America rejecting such communications as unfounded. These communications informed the Secretary-General that under the Declaration on Berlin of 5 May 1955, the Federal Republic of Germany had conditional authorisation from the Allied Kommandatura to extend to Berlin the international agreements concluded by the Federal Republic.

- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 21 November 1947; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.
- Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 18 April 1961; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.
- Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, Concerning Acquisition of Nationality, 18 April 1961; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.
- Protocol Amending the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on Narcotic Drugs, concluded at The Hague on 23 January 1912, at Geneva on 11 February 1925, 19 February 1925 and 13 July 1931, at Bangkok on 27 November 1931 and Geneva on 26 June 1936; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of theFederal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.
- Protocol Briing under International Control Drugs Outside the Scope of the Convention of 13 July 1931 for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, as amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946, 19 November 1948; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.
- Protocol for Limiting and Regulating the Cultivation of the Poppy Plant, the Production of, International and Wholesale Trade in, and use of Opium, 23 June 1953; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.
- Constitution of the World Health Organization, 22 July 1946; communications (no dates available) from

the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

- Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, 4 June 1954; Additional Protocol to the Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, relating to the Importation of Tourist Publicity Documents and Material, 4 June 1954; and Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles, 4 June 1954; communication (no date available) from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.
- Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles, 4 June 1954; communication (no date available) from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.
- Customs Convention on Containers, 18 May 1956; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.
- Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Commercial Road Vehicles, 18 May 1956; communications (no dates available) fromthe Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.
- European Convention on Customs Treatment of Pallets used in International Transport, 9 December 1960; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.
- European Agreement on Road Markings, 13 December 1957; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.
- Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Technical Prescriptions for Wheeled Vehicles, Equipment and Parts which can be fitted and/or be used on Wheeled Vehicles and the Conditions for Reciprocal Recognition of Approvals Granted on the Basis of These Prescriptions, 20 March 1958; communications from the Governments of France (23 November 1966 and 21 August 1968), the United Kingdom (23 November 1966 and 21 August 1968), the Federal Republic of Germany (25 November 1966 and 21 August 1968) and the United States of America (21 August 1968).
- Convention on the Taxation of Road Vehicles for Private Use in International Traffic, 18 May 1956; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.
- Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR), 19 May 1956; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.
- Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Technical Prescriptions for Wheeled Vehicles, Equipment and Parts which can be fitted and/or be used on Wheeled Vehicles and the Conditions for Reciprocal Recognition of Approvals Granted on the Basis of These Prescriptions, 20 March 1958; communications from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany (25 November 1966 and 21 August 1968), France (23 November 1966 and 21 August 1968), the United Kingdom (23 Nomber 1966 and 21 August 1968) and the United States of America (21 August 1968).
- International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organisations, 26 October 1961; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.
- Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, 7 September 1956; communication (no date available) from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.
- Convention on the Recovery Abroad of Maintenance, 20 June 1956; communication (no dates available) from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.
- Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, 10 June 1958; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

5. For a number of amendments, agreements, conventions or protocols (noted here), including some of those noted at points 3 and 4, the initial communication from the Federal Republic of Germany gave rise to communications to the effect that the initial communication was invalid because it was in contradiction to the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 between the Governments of France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. The Quadripartite Agreement was said to confirm that West Berlin was not a *"Land"* (where this term had been used) or constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and could not be governed by it, and that treaties affecting matters of security and status could not be extended to West Berlin by the Federal Republic of Germany. Theinitial communication of the Federal Republic of Germany was said, in the case of almost every instrument noted hereo contradict or be incompatible with one or a combination of these stipulations (in one case, for the specific reason that it encroached on an area of competence of the German Democratic Republic) (as noted here). In the one exception to this rule (as noted here), the communication was said to encroach on an area of responsibility reserved for the authorities of France, the United Kingdom and the United States.

- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, 13 February 1946; communication from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 9 November 1981) and the German Democratic Republic (both re: security and status).

- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 21 November 1947; declaration upon accession (deposited 4 October 1974) of the Government of the German Democratic Republic (re: government).
- Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 18 April 1961; communication (received 27 December 1973) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic (re: government).
- Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, Concerning Acquisition of Nationality, 18 April 1961; communication (received 27 December 1973) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic (re: government).
- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 9 December 1948; communication (received 27 December 1973) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic (re: government).
- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 7 March 1966; communication (received 27 December 1973) from the German Democratic Republic (re: government).
- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 16 December 1966; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received5 July 1974, and reaffirming position, 13 February 1975), the German Democratic Republic (received 12 August 1974) andUkrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (received 16 August 1974) (re: security and status).
- International Convention on Civil and Political Rights, 16 December 1966; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 5 July 1974, and reaffirming position, 13 February 1975), the German Democratic Republic (received 12 August 1974) and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (received 16 August 1974) (re: security and status).
- Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, 18 December 1979; communication from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 15 April 1986) and the German Democratic Republic (received 22 April 1987) (both re: security and status).
- Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, 28 September 1954; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 13 October 1976) (re: security and status).
- Protocol to amend the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, concluded at Geneva on 30 September 1921, and the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age, concluded at Geneva on 11 October 1933, 12 November 1947; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 4 December 1973) and the German Democratic Republic (accompanying the instrument of acceptance, deposited 16 July 1974) (both re: status).
- Protocol amending the International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 18 May 1904, and the International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910, 4 May 1949; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 4 December 1973) and the German Democratic Republic (accompanying the instrument of acceptance, deposited 16 July 1974) (both re: status).
- European Convention on Customs Treatment of Pallets in International Transport, 9 December 1960; communication upon accession (deposited 15 March 1977) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic (re: government).
- Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR), 19 May 1956; declaration upon accession (deposited 27 December 1973) of the Government of the German Democratic Republic (re: government).
- European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR), 30 September 1957; declarations upon accession from the Governments of the German Democratic Republic (deposited 27 December 1973) and Hungary (deposited 19 July 1979) (re: government).
- Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Technical Prescriptions for Wheeled Vehicles, Equipment and Parts which can be fitted and/or be used on Wheeled Vehicles and the Conditions for Reciprocal Recognition of Approvals Granted on the Basis of These Prescriptions, 20 March 1958; declaration upon accession (deposited 4 October 1974) of the Government of the German Democratic Republic (re: government) and communication upon accession (deposited 10 December 1986) of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (re: *"Land"* and government).
- Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 6 March 1948; communication (no date available) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic.
- Amendments to articles 17 and 18 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 15 September 1964; communication (no date available) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic.
- Amendment to article 28 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 28 September 1965; communication (no date available) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic.
- Convention relating to the unification of certain rules concerning collisions in inland navigation, 15 March 1960; communication from the Government of the German Democratic Republic (receed 8 October 1976) (re: area of competence of the German Democratic Republic).
- European Agreement on Main International Arteries, 15 November 1975; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 14 December 1982, and reaffirming position, 2 December 1985) (re: security and status).

- Convention on the Political Rights of Women, 31 March 1953; communication (received 27 December 1973) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic (re: government).

- Convention on the Nationality of Married Women, 20 February 1957; communications from the Governments of Czechoslovakia (received 30 May 1974) and the German Democratic Republic (received 16 July 1974) (both re: security and status).

- Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages, 10 December 1962; communication upon accession (deposited 16 July 1974) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic (re: government).

- Protocol amending the Slavery Convention signed at Geneva on 25 September 1926, 7 December 1953; communications from the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations (received 4 December 1973) and the Government of the German Democratic Republic (upon acceptance, deposited 16 July 1974) (both re: government and security and status).

- International Convention against the taking of hostages, 17 December 1979; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 9 November 1981) (re: security and status).

- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, 14 December 1973; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 21 July 1977) (re: security and status), the German Democratic Republic (received 22 December 1978) (re: government), Czechoslovakia (received 25 April 1979) (re: security and status) and Hungary (27 Novem 1979) (re: security and status).

- Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, 10 June 1958; communication upon accession (deposited 20 February 1975) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic (re: both government and security and status).

- Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, 10 December 1976; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 5 December 1983) and the German Democratic Republic (received 23 January 1984) (both re: area of responsibility reserved for the authorities of France, the United Kingdom and the United States).

6. For a number of other amendments, agreements, conventions or protocols (noted here), the initial communication from the Federal Republic of Germany gave rise to communications to the effect that the application of the relevant instrument to West Berlin would be considered valid only to the extent that it was in conformity with the provisions of the Quadripartite Agreement described at point 5.

- Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, 30 March 1961; communication from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 3 May 1974) and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (received 6 August 1974), and declaration upon accession of the German Democratic Republic (deposited 2 December 1975).

- Convention on Psychotropic substances, 21 February 1971; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 18 April 1977) and the German Democratic Republic (received 8 July 1977).

- Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, 25 March 1972; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 9 June 1975).

- Protocol to amend the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, concluded at Geneva on 30 September 1921, and the Convention for the Suppressi of the Traffic in Women of Full Age, concluded at Geneva on 11 October 1933, 12 November 1947; communication from the Government of Czechoslovakia (received 6 December 1973).

- Protocol amending the International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 18 May 1904, and the International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910, 4 May 1949; communication from the Government of Czechoslovakia (received 6 December 1973).

- Agreement establishing the International Fund for Agricultural Development, 13 June 1976; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 12 January 1978).

- Constitution of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, 8 April 1979; declaration from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 2 December 1985).

- Amendments to the title and substantive provisions of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 14 November 1975 and 9 November 1977; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 10 February 1978).

- Amendments to articles 17, 18, 20 and 51 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 15 November 1979; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 10 February 1978).

- Convention on the measurement of inland navigation vessels, 15 February 1966; declaration upon accession (deposited 31 August 1976) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic.

- Convention on the Nationality of Married Women, 20 February 1957; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 24 May 1974) and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (received 6 August 1974).

- Convention on the High Seas, 29 April 1958;communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 5 November 1973), Czechoslovakia (received 6 Decembr 1973), the

Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (13 February 1974) and the German Democratic Republic (received 27 December 1973).

- Optional Protocol of Signature concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, 29 April 1958. Communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 5 November 1973), Czechoslovakia (6 December 1973) and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (received 13 February 1974).
- Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, 13 November 1979; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 20 April 1983), the German Democratic Republic (received 28 July 1983) and Poland (received 19 July 1985).

7. For some of the amendments, agreements, conventions or protocols noted in point 6 (as listed here), the communications noted for them at that point, which stated that the application of the relevant instrument to West Berlin would be considered valid only to the extent that it was in conformity with the provisions of the Quadripartite Agreement, provoked responding communications. These responding communications made the point that a misleading reference had been made in the preceding communications to the statement in the Agreement that West Berlin continues "not to be [a] constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and not to be governed by it.".

- Agreement establishing the International Fund for Agricultural Development, 13 June 1976; communication from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 11 July 1978) (re: misleading reference).
- Constitution of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, 8 April 1979; communication from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 29 October 1986) (re: misleadingreference).

8. For the amendments, agreements, conventions or protocols noted in point 5 (as listed here), and for a number of such instruments noted in point 3 (as listed here), some of the related communications objecting to the initial declaration of the Federal Republic of Germany on the basis of the provisions of the Quadripartite Agreement or otherwise gave rise to further communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (as noted here). At the essence of these communications was, in one case (as noted here), a denial that the material content of the relevant instrument could affect matters of security and status, and in all cases, the claim that the extension of the relevant instrument by the Federal Republic of Germany was valid and continued to have full effect because it had received proper prior authorization from the authorities of France, the United Kingdom and the United States which had followed established procedures endorsed under the Agreement to ensure matters of security and status were not affected, and integral elements of the Agreement allowed for the limited extension of instruments to West Berlin where matters of security and status were not affected. Communications of this nature were often followed closely by communications from the Federal Republic of Germany indicating its solidarity with the position taken (as noted here).

- Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 18 April 1961; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 17 June 1974), and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 15 July 1974).
- Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, Concerning Acquisition of Nationality, 18 April 1961; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 17 June 1974) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 15 July 1974).
- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 9 December 1948; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 17 June 1974) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 15 July 1974).
- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 7 March 1966; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 17 June 1974) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 15 July 1974).
- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 16 December 1966; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 5 November 1974) (including denial re: security and status) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 6 December 1974).
- International Convention on Civil and Political Rights, 16 December 1966; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 5 November 1974) (including denial re: security and status) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 6 December 1974).
- Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, 18 December 1979; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 20 March 1987).
- Protocol to amend the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, concluded at Geneva on 30 September 1921, and the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age, concluded at Geneva on 11 October 1933, 12 November 1947; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 17 July 1974) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 27 August 1974).
- Protocol amending the International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at

Paris on 18 May 1904, and the International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910, 4 May 1949; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 17 July 1974) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 27 August 1974).

- Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR), 19 May 1956; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 17 June 1974 and 26 July 1984) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 15 July 1974 and 27 August 1984).
- European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR), 30 September 1957; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 17 June 1974) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 15 July 1974).
- Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Technical Prescriptions for Wheeled Vehicles, Equipment and Parts which can be Fitted and/or be Used on Wheeled Vehicles and the Conditions for Reciprocal Recognition of Approvals Granted on the Basis of These Prescriptions, 20 March 1958; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 8 July 1975) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).
- European Agreement on Main International Arteries, 15 November 1975; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 26 July 1984, and reaffirming position, 29 October 1986) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 23 August 1984).
- Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 6 March 1948; communication from the Permanent Representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the Acting Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations (received 10 December 1973) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (also received 10 December 1973).
- Amendments to articles 17 and 18 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 15 September 1964; communication from the Permanent Representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the Acting Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations (received 10 December 1973) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (also received 10 December 1973).
- Amendment to article 28 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 28 September 1965; communication from the Permanent Representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the Acting Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations (received 10 December 1973) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (also received 10 December 1973).
- Convention on the Political Rights of Women, 31 March 1953; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 17 June 1974) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 15 July 1974).
- Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages, 10 December 1962; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 8 July 1975) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).
- Protocol amending the Slavery Convention signed at Geneva on 25 September 1926, 7 December 1953; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 17 July 1974 and 8 July 1975) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 27 August 1974 and 19 September 1975).
- International Convention against the taking of hostages, 17 December 1979; communications from the Governments of France,the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 4 June 1982) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 12 August 1982).
- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, 14 December 1973; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 7 December 1977) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 13 February 1978).

9. For a number of the instruments noted in points 5 and 8 (as listed here), the relevant communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and the Federal Republic of Germany gave rise to further communications from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (noted here), and in some cases also the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (also noted here). These communications expressed solidarity with the position taken by the Government of the German Democratic Republic in the communications noted in point 5, and/or emphasized similar objections to those referred to in point 5 regarding the impropriety and invalidity of the use of the term "Land" in extending the relevant instrument to West Berlin (as noted here). In some cases, the communications also reasserted the breach of the "security and status" provisions of the Quadripartite Agreement described in point 5 (as noted here). In exceptional cases, rather than expressing solidarity with the Government of the German Democratic Republic, the communications expressed the same conditional acceptance of the extension of the relevant instrument to West Berlin as described in point 6 (as noted here).

- Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 18 April 1961; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 12 September 1974, and reaffirming position, 8 December 1975) and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (received 19 September 1974) (both re:solidarity and "Land").

- Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, Concerning Acquisition of Nationality, 18 April 1961; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 12 September 1974, and reaffirming position, 8 December 1975) and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (received 19 September 1974) (both re: solidarity and "Land").
- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 9 December 1948; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 12 September 1974, and reaffirming position, 8 December 1975) and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (received 19 September 1974) (both re: solidarity and "Land").
- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 7 March 1966; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 12 September 1974, and reaffirming position, 8 December 1975) and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (received 19 September 1974) (both re: solidarity and "Land").
- Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR), 19 May 1956; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 2 December 1985) (re: "Land" and security and status).
- European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR), 30 September 1957; communication (received 12 September 1974, and reaffirming position, 8 December 1975) (re: solidarity and "Land") from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.
- Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 6 March 1948; communication from the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 16 April 1974) (re: conditional acceptance).
- Amendments to articles 17 and 18 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 15 September 1964; communication from the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 16 April 1974) (re: conditional acceptance).
- Amendment to article 28 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 28 September 1965; communication from the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 16 April 1974) (re: conditional acceptance).

10. For some of the instruments noted at point 9 (as listed here), the communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, which had expressed solidarity with the German Democratic Republic and protested the extension of the relevant instrument to "Land Berlin", provoked responding communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (noted here). In essence, the communications responding to those of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics asserted that the extension of the relevant instrument by the Federal Republic of Germany was valid and continued to have full effect for the same reasons of proper authorization detailed in point 6, and also defended the legitimacy under the Quadripartite Agreement of the terminology ("Land Berlin") used by the Federal Republic of Germany in its extension of the relevant instrument to the Western Sectors of Berlin. The communications responding to those of the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic asserted that this Government was not competent to comment authoritatively on the provisions of the Quadripartite Agreement because it was not a party to the agreement. The communications were followed closely by communications from the Federal Republic of Germany indicating its solidarity with the position taken.

- Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 18 April 1961; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (two received 8 July 1975) (responding to the preceding communications of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republics respectively), and from the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).
- Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, Concerning Acquisition of Nationality, 18 April 1961; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America re: authorization and terminology (two received 8 July 1975) (responding to the preceding communications of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republics respectively), and from the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).
- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 9 December 1948; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America re: authorization and terminology (two received 8 July 1975) (responding to the preceding communications of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic respectively), and from the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).
- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 7 March 1966; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (two received 8 July 1975) (responding to the preceding communications of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic respectively), and from the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).
- European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR), 30

September 1957; communications from the Governments of France, the UnitedKingdom and the United States of America (two received 8 July 1975) (responding to the preceding communications of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic respectively), and from the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).

11. For a number of the amendments, agreements, conventions or protocols noted in points 5, 6, 8 and 9, relevant communications provoked further communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America with different combinations of content to those described above (noted here). These communications made, in one case (as noted here) a denial of the Government of the German Democratic Republic's assertion of competence for the subject matter of the relevant instrument (as noted here), and in all cases: the same assertion regarding the authorization of the extension of the relevant instrument by the Federal Republic of Germany as described in points 6 and 10 (as noted here); and/or the same assertion regarding the use of terminology in that assertion as described in point 10 (as noted here); and/or the same assertion regarding the competence of the makers of the preceding communications as described in point 10; and/or the same allegation regarding the making of a misleading reference to the Quadripartite Agreement as described in point 7 (as noted here). Each variety of communication was followed closely by communications from the Federal Republic of Germany indicating its solidarity with the position taken (as noted here).

- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, 13 February 1946; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 8 June 1982) (re: authorization and competence), and from the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 16 August 1982).
- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialised Agencies, 21 November 1947; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 8 July 1975) (re: competence and authorization), and from the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).
- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 16 December 1966; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 8 July 1975) (re: competence and authorization), and from the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).
- International Convention on Civil and Political Rights, 16 December 1966; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 8 July 1975) (re: competence and authorization), and from the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).
- Protocol to amend the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, concluded at Geneva on 30 September 1921, and the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age, concluded at Geneva on 11 October 1933, 12 November 1947; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 8 July 1975) (re: competence and authorization) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).
- Protocol amending the International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 18 May 1904, and the International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910, 4 May 1949; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 8 July 1975) (re: competence and authorization) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).
- Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR), 19 May 1956; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 6 October 1986) (re: authorization and misleading reference) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 15 January 1987).
- Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Technical Prescriptions for Wheeled Vehicles, Equipment and Parts which can be Fitted and/or be Used on Wheeled Vehicles and the Conditions for Reciprocal Recognition of Approvals Granted on the Basis of These Prescriptions, 20 March 1958; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 30 October 1987) (re: authorization and terminology) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 23 December 1987).
- Convention relating to the unification of certain rules concerning collisions in inland navigation, 15 March 1960; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 13 June 1977) (including denial of the Government of the German Democratic Republic's assertion of competence) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 July 1977).
- Convention on the Nationality of Married Women, 20 February 1957; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 8 July 1975) (re: competence and authorization), and from the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).
- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, 14 December 1973; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 21 August 1979) (re: competence), and from the

Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 18 October 1979).

- Convention on the High Seas, 29 April 1958; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 8 July 1975) (re: competence and misleading reference).

- Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, 10 June 1958; communication from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 26 January 1976) (reaffirming previous communications regarding other instruments re: competence and terminology, and competence and authorization respectively) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 24 February 1976).

- Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, 10 December 1976; communication from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 2 July 1984) (re: authorization and competence) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 5 June 1985).

- Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, 13 November 1979; communication from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 27 April 1984) (re: misleading reference and competence) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 13 June 1984).

12. For some of the instruments noted at point 11 (as listed here), the relevant communications asserting the lack of competence of the makers of the preceding communications to comment on the provisions of the Quadripartite Agreement gave rise to further communications from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or the maker itself (as noted here) rejecting these assertions as unfounded. In one case (as noted here), the responding communication of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics expressed support for the maker's preceding claim of competence (noted at point 5) in relation to the subject matter of the relevant instrument as a basis for comment on the Agreement. In the other cases, the responding communications reaffirmed the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics' own objections to or conditional acceptance of the extension of the relevant instrument to West Berlin described in points 5 and 6 and/or asserted the indisputable right of other parties to the instrument to express an opinion on the matter (as noted here).

- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, 13 February 1946; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 29 December 1982) (re: previous objections and indisputable right).

- Convention relating to the unification of certain rules concerning collisions in inland navigation, 15 March 1960; communications from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 18 October 1977) (re: claim of competence).

- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, 14 December 1973; communication from the Government of Czechoslovakia (received 25 January 1980) (re: indisputable right).

- Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, 10 December 1976; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 2 December 1985) (re: indisputable right).

- Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, 13 November 1979; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 2 December 1985) (re: conditional acceptance and indisputable right).

13. For the instruments noted at point 12 (listed again here), the communications in reply from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics gave rise to further communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (noted here). These communications reaffirmed the positions described in point 11, in one case (as noted here) making an assertion of factual error in the communication of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and in the others (as noted here), with respect to the competence of non-parties to the Quadripartite Agreement to comment on its provisions, emphasizing that the Agreement was part of conventional, not customary international law. In two cases the communication was followed closely by a communication from the Federal Republic of Germany indicating its solidarity with the position taken (as noted here).

- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, 13 February 1946; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 7 July 1983) (re: competence).

- Convention relating to the unification of certain rules concerning collisions in inland navigation, 15 March 1960; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 21 April 1978) (re: factual error) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 30 May 1978).

- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, 14 December 1973; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 18 February 1982) (re: competence) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 2 April 1982).

- Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, 10 December 1976; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 6 October 1986) (re: competence).

- Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, 13 November 1979; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 28 July 1986) (re: competence).

14. Finally, it should be noted that on 3 October 1990 the Secretary-General received a communication from the Government of Hungary indicating that, the German State having achieved its unity on this day [3 October 1990], it had decided to withdraw, as from that date, declarations made by it with respect to the notification of extension by the Federal Republic of Germany to "Land Berlin" of the instruments listed here.

- Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 18 April 1961.
- Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, Concerning Acquisition of Nationality, 18 April 1961.
- Protocol Amending the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on Narcotic Drugs, concluded at the Hague on 23 January 1912, at Geneva on 11 February 1925, 19 February 1925 and 13 July 1931, at Bangkok on 27 November 1931 and Geneva on 26 June 1936.
- Protocol Bringing under International Control Drugs Outside the Scope of the Convention of 13 July 1931 for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, as amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946, 19 November 1948.
- Constitution of the World Health Organization, 22 July 1946.
- Customs Convention on Containers, 18 May 1956.
- Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Commercial Road Vehicles, 18 May 1956.
- European Convention on Customs Treatment of Pallets used in International Transport, 9 December 1960.
- European Agreement on Road Markings, 13 December 1957.
- Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR), 19 May 1956.
- European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR), 30 September 1957.
- Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Technical Prescriptions for Wheeled Vehicles, Equipment and Parts which can be Fitted and/or be Used on Wheeled Vehicles and the Conditions for Reciprocal Recognition of Approvals Granted on the Basis of These Prescriptions, 20 March 1958.
- Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages, 10 December 1962.
- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, 14 December 1973.

15. See Note at point 2 above:

- Annex I - International Labour Organisation (ILO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 10 July 1948 (application deposited 10 October 1957).
- Annex II - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 29 November 1948 (application deposited 10 October 1957).
- Revised text of Annex II - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 20 November 1959 (application deposited 23 May 1963).
- Second revised text of Annex II - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 8 December 1965 (application deposited 11 June 1985).
- Annex III - International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 21 June 1948 (application deposited 10 October 1957).
- Annex IV - United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 7 February 1949 (application deposited 10 October 1957).
- Annex V - International Monetary Fund (IMF) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 11 April 1949 (application deposited 10 October 1957).
- Annex VI - International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 19 April 1949 (application deposited 10 October 1957).
- Annex VII - World Health Organization (WHO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 17 July1948 (application deposited 10 October 1957).
- Second revised text of Annex VII - World Health Organization (WHO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 27 May 1957 (application deposited 5 September 1958).
- Third revised text of Annex VII - World Health Organization (WHO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 17 July 1959 (application deposited 11 February 1959).
- Annex VIII - Universal Postal Union (UPU) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 25 May 1949 (application deposited 19 May 1958).
- Annex IX - International Telecommunication Union (ITU) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 6 October 1950 (application deposited 10 October 1957).
- Annex XI - World Meteorological Organization (WMO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 17 April 1951 (application deposited 10 October 1957).
- Annex XII - International Maritime Organization (IMO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and

Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 16 January 1959 (application deposited 12 January 1962).

- Revised text of Annex XII - International Maritime Organization (IMO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 16 May 1968 (application deposited 11 June 1985).
- Annex XIII - International Finance Corporation (IFC) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 2 April 1959 (application deposited 12 April 1962).
- Annex XIV - International Development Association (IDA) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 13 February 1962 (application deposited 11 June 1985).
- Annex XV - World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 4 October 1977 (application deposited 20 August 1979).
- Annex XVI - International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 16 December 1977 (application deposited 20 August 1979).
- Annex XVII - United Nations Development Organization (UNIDO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 3 July 1987 (application deposited 3 March 1989).

Note 2.

In a communication dated 3 October 1990, the Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany notified the Secretary-General of the following:

". . . Through the accession of the German Democratic Republic to the Federal Republic of Germany with effect from 3 October 1990, the two German States have united to form one sovereign State, which as a single Member of the United Nations remains bound by the provisions of the Charter in accordance with the solemn declaration of 12 June 1973. As from the date of unification, the Federal Republic of Germany will act in the United Nations under the designation `Germany'."

The former German Democratic Republic was admitted to the Organization on 18 September 1973 by Resolution No. 3050 (XXVIII). For the text of the declaration of acceptance of the obligations contained in the Charter dated 12 June 1973 made by the German Democratic Republic (registered under No. 12758), see United Nations, Treaty Series , vol. 891, p. 103.

Consequently, and in the light of articles 11 and 12 of the Treaty of 31 August 1990 (Unification Treaty) between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic, entries in status lists pertaining to formalities (i.e., signatures, ratifications, accessions, declarations and reservations, etc.) effected by the Federal Republic of Germany will now appear under "Germany" and indicate the dates of such formalities.

As regards treaties in respect of which formalities had been effected by both the Federal Republic of Germany and the former German Democratic Republic prior to unification, the entry will similarly indicate in the corresponding table the type of formality effected by the Federal Republic of Germany and the date on which it took place, while the type of formality effected by the former German Democratic Republic and the date thereof will appear in a footnote.

Finally, as regards the treatment of treaties in respect of which formalities were effected by the former German Democratic Republic alone, article 12, para. 3 of the Unification Treaty contains the following provision: "Should the united Germany intend to accede to international organizations or other multilateral treaties of which the German Democratic Republic but not the Federal Republic of Germany is a member, agreement shall be reached with the respective contracting parties and with the European Communities where the latter's competence is affected". Accordingly, a footnote indicating the date and type of formality effected by the former German Democratic Republic will be included in the status of the treaties concerned, the corresponding footnote indicator being inserted next to the heading "Participant".

GREECE

Note 1.

On 25 January 1995, the Secretary-General received a communication dated 20 January 1995 from the Government of Greece which reads as follows:

The Government of the Hellenic Republic declares that the accession of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Conventions deposited with the Secretary-General to which the Hellenic Republic is also a contracting party does not imply recognition of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia by the Hellenic Republic.

This statement shall apply to all Conventions or other international Agreements deposited with the Secretary-General to which the Hellenic Republic and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia are parties.

See also note 1 under "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia".

HONG KONG

See note 2 under "China" and “United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland”.

INDONESIA

Note 1.

In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 20 January 1965, the First Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia informed the Secretary-General that "Indonesia has decided at this stage and under the present circumstances to withdraw from the United Nations". In his reply of 26 February 1965, after noting the contents of the letter from the Government of Indonesia, the Secretary-General expressed "the earnest hope that in due time [Indonesia] will resume full co-operation with the United Nations". For the text of the letter from Indonesia and the Secretary-General's reply, see document A/5857 and Corr.1 and A/5899.

In a telegram of 19 September 1966, the Government of Indonesia informed the Secretary-General that it "has decided to resume full co-operation with the United Nations and to resume participation in its activities starting with the twenty-first session of the General Assembly". For the text of that telegram, see document A/6419.

At the 1420th plenary meeting of the General Assembly held on 28 September 1966, the President of the General Assembly, referring to the above-mentioned correspondence and to the decision of the Government of Indonesia "to resume full co-operation with the United Nations", stated, inter alia, that "it would appear, therefore, that the Government of Indonesia considers that its recent absence from the Organization was based not upon a withdrawal from the United Nations but upon a cessation of co-operation. The action so far taken by the United Nations on this matter would not appear to preclude this view. If this is also the general view of the membership, the Secretary-General would give instructions for the necessary administrative action to be taken for Indonesia to participate again in the proceedings of the Organization . . . Unless I hear any objection, I would assume that it is the will of the membership that Indonesia should resume full participation in the activities ofe United Nations and the Secretary-General may proceed in the manner I have outlined." There having been no objection, the President invited the representatives of Indonesia to take their seats in the General Assembly *(See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Plenary Meetings, 1420th meeting.)*

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Note 1.

By a communication received on 4 November 1982, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran notified the Secretary-General that the designation "Iran (Islamic Republic of)" should henceforth be used.

LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Note 1.

Formerly: "Laos" until 22 December 1975.

LATVIA

Note 1.

In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 26 February 1993, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Latvia informed the Secretary-General that "Latvia does not regard itself as party by virtue of the doctrine of treaty succession to any bilateral or multilateral treaties entered into by the former USSR."

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA

Note 1.

By two communications dated 1 and 18 April 1977, respectively, the Permanent Mission of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya informed the Secretary-General that the official designation "Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya" (short title: "Libyan Arab Jamahiriya") should be substituted for "Libyan Arab Republic". (Before 6 January 1971: "Libya".)

LITHUANIA

Note 1.

On 23 June 1995, the Secretary-General received a letter, dated 22 June 1995 and signed by the Permanent Representative of the Government of Lithuania to the United Nations, transmitting a note from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs declaring the following:

".... The Republic of Lithuania was occupied by the USSR on the 15th of June 1940. Many Western countries did not recognize the incorporation of the Republic of Lithuania into the USSR.

Having restored its independence on the 11th of March 1990, the Republic of Lithuania neither is nor can be the successor state of the former USSR. The Republic of Lithuania can not take the responsibility for the treaties concluded by the former USSR, for it neither participated in making those treaties nor influenced them. Therefore the Republic of Lithuania can not take the responsibility for the past treaties concluded by the USSR ."

MACAO

Note 1.

At its 3rd plenary meeting, on 4 February 2000, the Economic and Social Council decided to amend paragraphs 2 and 4 of the terms of reference of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific by changing the English-language spelling of "Macau, China" to Macao, China."

See also note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portugal".

MALAYSIA

Note 1.

On 16 September 1963, the Permanent Representative of Malaysia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General the following communication:

"By the Constitutional process of Amendment provided for in Article 159 of the Constitution of the Federation of Malaya carried out recently in both Houses of Parliament with the requisite two-thirds majorities, the name of the State as set out in Article 1 thereof has been changed from `Federation of Malaya' to `Malaysia'.

"This Mission has therefore from this date assumed the name of `Permanent Mission of Malaysia to the United Nations'.

"I shall be grateful for your having this change noted and also for your bringing it to the notice of all Missions accredited to the United Nations."

Subsequently, the Government of Malaysia confirmed to the Secretary-General that all multilateral treaties, in respect of which he acts as depositary and to which the

Federation of Malaysia has become a party either by succession or by ratification or accession, continue to be binding on Malaysia, and that henceforth Malaysia should be listed in the relevant United Nations publications as a party to those treaties.

MALDIVES

Note 1.

In a letter of 14 April 1969, the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Maldives to the United Nations informed the Secretary-General that "after the change from a Sultanate to a Republican Administration, the Maldivian Government has decided that the country be known as `Maldives' instead of `Maldive Islands' and that the full title of the State be called `Republic of Maldives'".

MICRONESIA (FEDERATED STATES OF)

Note 1.

On 11 August 1992, the Secretary-General transmitted the following declaration dated 22 May 1992 emanating from the Secretary of External Affairs of the Federated States of Micronesia to the Secretary-General containing a declaration setting out the position of the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) with regard to international agreements entered into by the United States of America and made applicable to the FSM pursuant to the United Nations Trusteeship Agreement for the former Japanese Mandated islands:

"On November 3, 1986, the application of treaties and international agreements to the Federated States of Micronesia by virtue of the application of treaties by the United States of America to the United Nations Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, ceased. With regard to all bilateral treaties validly concluded by the United States on behalf of the Federated States of Micronesia, or validly applied or extended by the former to the latter before November 3, 1986, the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia declares that it will examine each such treaty and communicate its view to the other State Party concerned. In the meantime, the Federated States of Micronesia will continue to observe the terms of each treaty which validly so applies and is not inconsistent with the letter or the spirit of the Constitution of the Federated States of Micronesia, provisionally and on a basis of reciprocity. The period of examination will extend until November 3, 1995, except in the case of any treaty in respect of which an earlier statement of views is or has been made. At the expiration of that period, the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia will consider such of these treaties that could not by the application of the rules of customary international law be regarded as otherwise surviving, as having terminated.

It is the earnest hope of the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia that during the aforementioned period of examination, the normal processes of diplomatic negotiations will enable it to reach satisfactory accord with the States Parties concerned upon the possibility of the continuance or modification of such treaties.

With regard to multilateral treaties previously applied, the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia intends to review each of them individually and to communicate to the depositary in each case what steps it wishes to take, whether by way of confirmation or termination, confirmation of succession or accession. During such period of review, any party to a multilateral treaty that has, prior to November 3, 1986, been validly applied or extended to the Federated States of Micronesia and is not inconsistent with the letter or spirit of the Constitution of the Federated States of Micronesia may, on a basis of reciprocity, rely as against the Federated States of Micronesia on the terms of such treaty."

Further, on 15 November 1995, the Secretary-General circulated a communication dated 2 November 1995 from the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia indicating that it had decided to extend the period of examination of the bilateral treaties indicated in its letter of 22 May 1992 for two additional years or until 3 November 1997.

MONTENEGRO

Note 1.

The National Assembly of the Republic of Montenegro adopted its Declaration of Independence on 3 June 2006, following the referendum in the Republic of Montenegro on 21 May 2006, which took place pursuant to Article 60 of the Constitutional Charter of Serbia and Montenegro. Montenegro was admitted to membership in the United Nations by General Assembly resolution A/RES/60/264 on 28 June 2006.

In a letter dated 10 October 2006, received by the Secretary-General on 23 October 2006 and accompanied by a list of multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General, the Government of the Republic of Montenegro notified that:

"[The Government of]…the Republic of Montenegro decided to succeed to the treaties to which the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro was a party or signatory.

[The Government of]…the Republic of Montenegro succeeds to the treaties listed in the attached Annex and undertakes faithfully to perform and carry out the stipulations therein contained as from June 3rd 2006, which is the date the Republic of Montenegro assumed responsibility for its international relations and the Parliament of Montenegro adopted the Declaration of Independence.

[The Government of]…the Republic of Montenegro does maintain the reservations, declarations and objections made by Serbia and Montenegro, as indicated in the Annex to this instrument, prior to the date on which the Republic of Montenegro assumed responsibility for its international relations."

See also notes 1 under "Serbia" and "Serbia and Montenegro".

MYANMAR

Note 1.

Formerly: "Burma" until 17 June 1989.

As mentioned in the latest official list of the League of Nations, Burma, which was formerly a part of India, was separated from the latter on 1 April 1937 and had possessed since that time the status of an overseas territory of the United Kingdom. It was as such that Burma continued to be bound by a ratification or accession to various multilateral treaties recorded on behalf of India.

NAMIBIA

Note 1.

Formerly: "Namibia (United Nations Council for Namibia)" until independence (21 March 1990).

The legal status of the United Nations Council for Namibia for the purpose of its participation in treaties was an issue during the period prior to Namibia's assuming responsibility for its international relations and becoming a member State of the United Nations. The Council for Namibia was established as a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly by resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967. As a subsidiary organ, it was responsible to, and under the authority of, the General Assembly in the same way as any other subsidiary organ. Unlike other subsidiary organs, however, the Council functioned in a dual capacity: as a policy-making organ of the General Assembly and as the legal Administering Authority of a Trust Territory. This latter characteristic of the Council distinguished it from other United Nations subsidiary organs and it could, therefore, be considered an organ sui generis for certain purposes. As the legal Administering Authority, the Council was expressly endowed by the General Assembly with certain competences and functions to be exercised on behalf of Namibia in terms comparable to that of a Government, inter alia, to represent Namibia internationally. Even though South Africa continued, at the time, to exercise de facto control over the Territory, the essential element was that the Council had the de jure competence, inter alia, to enact any necessary laws and recognitions. Indeed, the Council became a party to many treaties deposited with the Secretary-General, such as the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 1966; the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid, 1973; the Constitution of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, 1979; and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, 1982.

NETHERLANDS

Note 1.

By a communication received on 30 December 1985, the Government of the Netherlands informed the Secretary-General that "the island of Aruba which was a part of the Netherlands Antilles would obtain internal autonomy as a separate country within the Kingdom of the Netherlands as of l January 1986". The said change would have no consequence in international law. The treaties concluded by the Kingdom which applied to the Netherlands Antilles, including Aruba, would continue, after 1 January 1986 to apply to the Netherlands Antilles (of which Aruba is no longer a part) and to Aruba.

NETHERLANDS ANTILLES

See note 1 under "Netherlands" .

NEW ZEALAND

Note 1.

In a communication dated 10 April 2002, the Government of New Zealand confirmed the following in respect of Tokelau:

"Consistent with international law, New Zealand regards all treaty actions as extending to Tokelau as a non-self-governing territory of New Zealand unless express provision to the contrary is included in the relevant treaty instrument."

See notes 1 under "Cook Islands" and "Niue".

NICARAGUA

See note 1 under "Costa Rica".

NIUE

Note 1.

Formerly administered by New Zealand, the Cook Islands and Niue currently have the status of self-governing States in free association with New Zealand.

The responsibility of the Cook Islands and Niue to conduct their own international relations and particularly to conclude treaties has evolved substantially over the years. For a period of time it was considered that, in view of the fact that the Cook Island and Niue, though self-governing, had entered into special relationships with New Zealand, which discharged the responsibilities for the external relations and defence of the Cook Islands and Niue at their request, it followed that the Cook Islands and Niue did not have their own treaty making capacity.

However, in 1984, an application by the Cook Islands for membership in the World Health Organization was approved by the World Health Assembly in accordance with its article 6, and the Cook Islands, in accordance with article 79, became a member upon deposit of an instrument of acceptance with the Secretary-General. In the circumstances, the Secretary-General felt that the question of the status, as a State, of the Cook Islands, had been duly decided in the affirmative by the World Heath Assembly, whose membership was fully respresentative of the international community.

On the basis of the Cook Islands' membership in the World Health Organization, and of its subsequent admittance to other specialized agencies (Food and Agriculture Organization in 1985, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in 1985 and the International Civil Aviation Organization in 1986) as a full member without any specifications or limitations, the Secretary-General considered that the Cook Islands could participate in a treaty in its own right as a State. Consequently, the Cook Islands signed the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention on Biological Diversity in 1992.

The same solution was adopted by the SecretarGeneral following the approval of Niue's application for membership in the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in 1993 and of the World Health Organization in 1994.

As a result of these developments, the Secretary-General, as depositary of multilateral treaties, recognized the full treaty-making capacity of the Cook Islands in 1992 and of Niue in 1994.

PALAU

Note 1.

In a letter dated 10 November 1994, the President of the Republic of Palau stated, *inter alia* :

"... With regard to multilateral treaties previously applied, the Government of the Republic of Palau intends to review each of them individually and to communicate to the depositary in each case what steps it wishes to take, whether by way of confirmation of termination, confirmation of succession or accession. During such period of review, any party to a multilateral treaty that has, prior to termination of the Trusteeship Agreement with respect to the Republic of Palau may, on a basis of reciprocity, rely as against the Republic of Palau on the terms of such treaty."

PALESTINE

Note 1.

Agreements adopted under the auspices of the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) are open for signature by the members of ESCWA. Palestine was admitted to membership in ESCWA pursuant to ECOSOC resolution 2089 (LXIII) dated 22 July 1977, which amended paragraph 2 of the terms of reference of the Commission. Full powers for the signature of the Agreements were issued by the Chairman of the Executive Council of the Palestine Liberation Organization and the President of the Palestinian National Authority.

PERU

22 March 1983

(Dated 18 March 1983)

First notification:

The Government has declared the extension of the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta, La Mar, Cangallo, Victor Fajardo y Huamanga, in the Department of Ayacucho, Andahuaylas in the Department of Apurímac, and Angaraes, Tayacaja and Acobamba in the Department of Huancavelica and for a period of 60 days from the date of the issue of the Supreme Decree No. 003-83-IN of 25 February 1983.

Suspension of the constitutional guarantees provided for in paragraphs 7, 9, 10 and 20 (g) of article 2 of the Political Constitution of Peru, which relate to the inviolability of the home, liberty of movement in the national territory, the right of peaceful assembly and the right to liberty and security of person.

In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 4 April 1983, the Government of Peru specified that the state of emergency extended by Supreme Decree No. 003-83-IN of 25 February 1983 was originally proclaimed by Supreme Decree No. 026-81-IN of 12 October 1981. It further specified that the provisions of the Covenant from which it was derogated by reason of the proclamation of the state of emergency were articles 9, 12, 17 and 21.

Second notification:

Extension of a state of emergency in the Department of Lima by Supreme Decree No. 005-83-IN of 9 March [1983], and suspension for a period of five days of the constitutional guarantees provided for in paragraphs 9, 10 and 20 (g) of article 2 of the Political Constitution of Peru relating to liberty of movement in the national territory, the right of peaceful assembly and the right to liberty and security of persons. Suspension of the state of emergency as from 14 March 1983.

3 May 1983

(Dated 27 April 1983)

Extension of derogations for a further 60 days by Supreme Decree 014-83-IN of 22 April 1983.

2 June 1983

(Dated 28 May 1983)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of thre days in Lima and in the province of Callao by Supreme Decree No. 020-83 of 25 May 1983.

(Dated 31 May 1983)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days throughout the Republic by Supreme Decree No. 022-83 of 30 May 1984.

9 August 1983

(Dated 8 August 1983)

Further extension of the state of emergency in its national territory for 60 days by Supreme Decree No. 036-83 of 2 August 1983.

29 September 1983

Termination as from 9 September 1983 of the state of emergency and of the derogations with the exceptions of the Departments of Huancavelica, Ayacucho and Apurímac.

9 November 1983

(Dated 3 November 1983)

Extension of the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta, La Mar, Cangallo, Víctor Fajardo y Huamanga (Department of Ayacucho), Andahuaylas (Department of Apurímac), Angaraes, Tayacaja and Acobamba (Department of Huancavelica) by Supreme Decree No. 054-83 of 22 October 1983.

20 December 1983

(Dated 19 December 1983)

Extension of the state of emergency in the provinces of Lucanas and Ayacucho (Department of Ayacucho) and the province of Huancavelica (Department of Huancavelica) by Supreme Decree No. 061-83-IN of 6 December 1983.

13 February 1984

(Dated 31 January 1984)

Extension of the state of emergency for 60 days in the provinces of Huanta, La Mar, Cangallo, Victor Fajardo and Huamanga (Department of Ayacucho), Andahuaylas (Department of Apurimac), Angaraes, Tayacaja and Acobamba (Department of Huancavelica), and in the districts of Querobamba and Cabana (Department of Ayacucho), and throughout the provinces of Lucanas (Department of Ayacucho) and Huancavelica (Department of Huancavelica) by Supreme Decree No. 061-83-IN of 6 December 1983.

28 March 1984

(Dated 26 March 1984)

Extension of state of emergency throughout Peru from 21 to 23 March 1984.

14 May 1984

(Dated 19 April 1984)

Continuation of the state of emerge for a period of 60 days in the provinces of Huanta, La Mar, Cangallo, Victor Fajardo and Huamanga and Lucanas (Department of Ayacucho); Andahuaylas and Chinceros (Department of Apurimac); Angaraes, Tayacaja, Acobamba, Huancavelica and Castrovirreyna (Department of Huancavelica) by Decree No. 031-84-IN of 17 April 1984.

18 June 1984

(Dated 15 June 1984)

Declaration of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days, starting from 8 June 1984, in the whole of the territory of the Republic of Peru.

9 August 1984

(Dated 12 July 1984)

Extension of the state of emergency as at 8 July 1984, for a period of 30 days, throughout the territory of the Republic of Peru.

14 August 1984

Extension of the state of emergency throughout Peru for a period of 60 days, starting from7 August 1984.

25 October 1984

(Dated 22 October 1984)

By Supreme Decree No. 052-84-IN of 5 October 1984 termination of the state of emergency in the territory of the Republic excepting the following provinces and departments, where the state of emergency has been extended for 60 days as of 5 October 1984:

- the Department of Huánuco; the province of Mariscal Cáceres (Department of San Martín); the provinces of Huanta, La Mar, Cangallo, Víctor Fajardo, Huamanga and Lucanas (Department of Ayacucho); the provinces of Andahuaylas and Chincheros (Department of Apurímac); the provinces of Angaraes, Tayacaja, Acobamba, Huancavelica and Castrovirreyna (Department of Huancavelica).

21 December 1984

(Dated 19 December 1984)

By Supreme Decree No. 063-84-IN, the Government of Peru had extended the state of emergency as at 3 December 1984, for a period of 60 days, in the Departments of Huánuco and San Martín and the Province of Mariscal Cáceres. The said extension had been declared owing to the continued terrorist acts of violence and sabotage in those regions and, as a resultthe Government of Peru continued to derogate from 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant.

(Dated 21 December 1984)

By Supreme Decree No. 065-84-IN, the Government of Peru had found it necessary to extend the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 7 December 1984, in the following provinces:

Ayacucho Department

- Cangallo, Huamanga, Huanta, La Mar, Lucanas, Víctor Fajardo, Huancasancos and Vilcashuamán;

Huancavelica Department

- Ancobamba, Angaraes, Castrovirreyna, Huancavelica, Tayacaja and Huaytará;

Apurímac Department

- Andahuaylas and Chincheros.

8 February 1985

(Dated 7 February 1985)

By Supreme Decree No. 001/85-IN, extension of the state of emergency as of 3 February 1985 in the Departments of San Martín, including the province of Tocache and excluding the Province of Mariscal Cáceres, and Huánco, excluding the Provinces of Puerto Inca and Pachitea.

By Supreme Decree No. 001/85-IN, exclusion of the state of emergency as of 3 February 1985 in the Department of San Martín, including the Province of Tocache and excluding the Province of Mariscal Cáceres, and Huánco, excluding the Provinces of Puerto Inca and Pachitea.

12 April 1985

(Dated 9 April 1985)

By Supreme Decree No. 012-85-IN, extension of the state of emergency as of 1 April 1985 in the Department of San Martín including the Province of Tocache, and in the Department of Huánco, except in the provinces of Puerto Inca and Pachitea.

18 June 1985

(14 June 1985)

By Supreme Decree No. 020-85-IN, the state of emergency in the Province of Pasco (Department of Pasco) has been declared for a period of 60 days, starting from 10 May l985.

By Supreme Decree No. 021-85-IN the state of emergency in the Department of San Martín, including the Province of Tocache and in the Department of Huánuco, except in the provinces of Puerto Inca and Pachitea, has been extended for a period of 60 days, starting from 1 June 1985.

By Supreme Decree No. 022-85-IN the state of emergency in theniel Alcides Carrión (Department of Pasco) has been extended for a period of 60 days, starting from 4 June 1985.

By Supreme Decree No. 023-85-IN, the state of emergency has been extended for a period of 60 days starting from 5 June 1985 in the following provinces:

Ayacucho Department

- Cangallo, Huamanga, Huanta, La Mar, Lucanas, Víctor Fajardo, Huancasancos and Vilcashuamán;

Huancavelica Department

- Acobamba, Angaraes, Castrovirreyna, Huancavelica, Tayacaja, Huaytará and Churcampa;

Apurimac Department

- Andahuaylas and Chincheros

The above-mentioned notifications specify that the state of emergency had been declared or extended as indicated above owing to the continued terrorist acts of violence and sabotage.

As a result, articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant are being or still being derogated from in the regions in question for the said periods of time.

24 July 1985

(Dated 23 July 1985)

By Supreme Decree No. 031-85, the state of emergency in the Province of Pasco (Department of Pasco) has been extended for a period of 60 days, starting from 10 July 1985.

6 August 1985

(Dated 31 July 1985)

By Supreme Decree No. 033-85-IN, the state of emergency in the Province of Yauli (Department of Junín) has been declared for a period of 12 days, starting from 19 July 1985.

12 August 1985

(Dated 12 August 1985)

By Supreme Decree No. 042-85-IN, the State of emergency has been extended for a period of 60 days starting from 6 August 1985 in the following provinces and departments:

(i) the province of Tocache (Department of San Martín);

(ii) the Department of Huánco, except the provinces of Puerto Inca and Pachitea;

(iii) the province of Daniel Alcides Carrión (Department of Pasco);

(iv) the provinces of Cangallo, Huamanga, Huanta, La Mar, Lucanas, Víctor Fajardo, Huancasancos and Vilcashuamán (Department of Ayacucho);

(v) the provinces of Acobamba, Angaraes, Castrovirreyna, Huancavelica, Andahuaylaseros (Department of Apurímac).

13 December 1985

(Dated 11 December 1985)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days in the following provinces, in accordance with Decree No. 052-85-IN as of 5 December 1985 (derogation from articles 9, 12, 17, and 21 of the Covenant), owing to continued terrorist actions in the said regions:

- Provinces of Cangallo, Huamanga, Huanta, La Mar, Víctor Fajardo, Huancasancos and Vilcashuamán (Department of Ayacucho);

- Provinces of Acobamba, Angaraes, Castrovirreyna, Huancavelica, Tayacaja, Huaytará and Churcampe (Department of Huancavelica);

- Provinces of Huaycabamba, Huamalíes, Dos de Mayo and Ambo (Department of Huánuco);

- Province of Chincheros (Department of Apurímac).

21 February 1986

(Dated 14 February 1986)

First notification

Extension as of 5 February 1986 by Decree No. 001-86 of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days in the same provinces as declared by Decree No. 052-85 IN (see notification of 13 December 1985).

Second notification

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days in the city of Lima and the Constitutional Province of Callao for a period of 60 days starting from 7 February 1986, in accordance with Decree No. 002-86.

The notifications specify that the extension was decided owing to continued terrorist actions and that articles 9, 12, 17, and 21 of the Covenant continue to be derogated from).

24 April 1986

(Dated 14 April 1986)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days in the same provinces and city as declared by Decrees No. 001-86 and 002-86 (see notifications of 21 February 1986), in accordance with Decree No. 004-86 and 005-86-IN as of 3 April 1986.

5 June 1986

(Dated 4 June 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 012-86-IN, extension of the state of emergency in the city of Lima and the Constitutional Province of Callao for a period of 60 days, starting from 2 June to 19 June 1986

(Dated 6 June 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 013-86-IN, extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 4 June 1986, in the provinces stated in the notification received on 21 February 1986.

23 June 1986

(Dated 20 June 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 015-86-IN, declaration of the state of emergency in the Provinces of Daniel Alcides Carrión and Pasco (Department of Pasco) for a period of 60 days, starting from 18 June 1986.

The Government of Peru specified that the said extensions and declaration of a state of emergency had been declared owing to the continuation or occurrence of terrorist acts and sabotage. As a result, articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant are being or still being derogated from in the regions in question for the said periods of time.

6 August 1986

(Dated 5 August 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 019-86-IN, extension of the state of emergency in the Province of Lima and the Constitutional Province of Callao for a period of 30 days, starting from 2 August 1986.

8 August 1986

(Dated 7 August 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 020-86-IN, for a period of 60 days starting from 3 August 1986, extension of the state of emergency in the same provinces as under notification of 18 June 1985 and the Department of Huánuco (Province of Huaycabamba, Huamalíes, Dos de Mayo and Ambo).

25 August 1986

(Dated 19 August 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 023-86-IN, extension of the State of Siege in the Provinces of Daniel Alcides Carrión and Pasco (Department of Pasco) for a period of 60 days, starting from 19 August 1986.

5 September 1986

(Dated 4 September 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 026-86-IN, extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days starting 1 September 1986 in the Province of Lima and the Constitutional Province of Callao.

The notification specifies that inasmuch as the municipal election process has begun, and in o to facilitate campaigning by political parties and independent candidates, without adversely affecting the security measures necessitated by the state of emergency, the prefectural authority, during the state of emergency, shall issue the appropriate regulations for governing the exercise of the right of assembly and the liberty of movement is partially re-established. In accordance with the said Decree, article 5, 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant continue to be derogated from, within the limits indicated above.

8 October 1986

(Dated 3 October 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 029-86-IN, extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting on 1 October 1986, in the same provinces as those indicated under the notification of 8 August 1986 (see above).

22 October 1986

(Dated 17 October 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 03-86-IN, extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 16 October 1986, in the Provinces of Daniel Alcides Carrión and Pasco (Department of Pasco). The notification further specifies that, during the state of emergency, the prefectoral authority shall issue the appropriate regulations for governing the exercise of the right of assembly.

5 November 1986

(Dated 3 November 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 03-86-IN, extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 16 October 1986, and starting from 29 October 1986, in the provinces of Lima and Callao (intervention of the prefectoral authority identical in essence, mutatis mutandis, to the one indicated in the notification of 22 October 1986). The notification further specifies that, the armed forces shall continue to maintain responsibility for public order in the provinces concerned.

18 December 1986

(Dated 16 December 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 036-86-IN, extension of the state of emergency in the Provinces of Daniel Alcides Carrión and Pasco (Department of Pasco) for a perioof 60 days, starting from 14 December 1986.

2 February 1987

(Dated 30 January 1987)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days as from 25 January 1987 in the Provinces of Lima and Callao.

(Dated 2 February 1987)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days as from 29 January 1987 in the provinces stated in notification of 13 December 1985.

Both notifications specify that the said extensions for the state of emergency had been declared owing to the continued terrorist acts of violence and sabotage.

4 March 1987

(Dated 23 February 1987)

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 60 days as from 13 February 1987 in the Provinces of Daniel Alcides Carrión and Pasco (Department of Pasco).

3 April 1987

(Dated 2 April 1987)

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 60 days in the Department of Ayacucho (Provinces of Cangallo, Huamanga, Huanta, La Mar, Víctor Fajardo, Huancasancos, Vilcashuaman and Sucre; Department of Apurimac (Province of Chincheros); and Department of Huánuco (Province of Ambo and District of Monzón of the Province of Huamaliés).

1 June 1987

(Dated 26 May 1987)

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 30 days from 26 May 1987 in the provinces of Lima and Callao.

The notification specifies that during the state of emergency, the Armed Forces shall maintain responsibility for domestic public order in those regions.

8 June 1987

(Dated 26 May 1987)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days in the provinces stated in the notification of 3 April 1987 as well as in the Department of Huancavelica (Province of Acobamba, Angaraes, Castrovierreyna, Huancavelica, Tayacajà, Huaytará and Churcampa).

18 June 1987

(Dated 8 June 1987)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days as from 8 June 1987 in the provinces stated in the notification of 4 March 1987 above

(Dated 24 June 1987)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days as from 20 June 1987 in the provinces of Lima and Callao (see also notification dated 23 July 1987 hereinafter).

23 July 1987

(20 July 1987)

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 30 days as from 20 July 1987 in the provinces of Lima and Callao.

The notifications of 24 June and 23 July 1987 specify that during the state of emergency, the Armed Forces shall maintain responsibility for domestic public order in those regions and that with respect to article 21 of the Covenant, the prefectural authority shall issue the appropriate regulations governing the exercise of the right of assembly, in accordance with the provisions of the said article 21 of the Covenant.

23 July 1987

(Dated 20 July 1987)

Declaration of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days as from 14 July 1987 in the following areas:

Province of Leoncio Prado and District of Cholón Province of Marañon (Department of Huánuco) Provinces of Mariscal Cáceres and Tocache (Department of San Martín).

The notification specifies that the State of emergency had been declared owing to the continuing acts of terrorism and sabotage in those regions.

As a result, articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant are being derogated from for the said period of time and that during the state of emergency, the Armed Forces shall continue to exercise political and military control of the areas in question.

4 August 1987

(Dated 25 July 1987)

Declaration of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 25 July 1987, in the Provinces of Cangallo, Huamanga, Huanta, La Mar, Víctor Fajardo, Huancasancos, Vilcashuamán and Sucre (Department of Ayacucho); Provinces of Acobamba, Angaraes, Castrovirreyna, Huancavelica, Taycaja, Huaytara and Churcampa (Department of Huancavelica); Province of Chincheros (Department of Apurímac); and Provinbo and District of Monzón of the Province of Huamalíes.

The notification specifies that the state of emergency had been declared owing to the continuing acts of terrorism and sabotage in those regions.

As a result, articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant are being derogated from for the said period of time; the notification further specifies that during the state of emergency, the Armed Forces shall continue to exercise political and military control of the areas in question.

13 August 1987

(Dated 7 August 1987)

Declaration of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, staring from 7 August 1987, in the Provinces of Daniel Alcides Carrión and Pasco (Department of Pasco).

The notification specifies that during the state of emergency, the Armed Forces shall maintain responsibility for domestic public order in the provinces in question and that with respect to article 21 of the Covenant, the prefectural authority shall issue the appropriate regulations governing the exercise of the right of assembly, in accordance with the provisions of the said article 21.

27 August 1987

(Dated 19 August 1987)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days, starting from 19 August 1987 in the Provinces of Lima and Callao.

23 September 1987

(Dated 13 September 1987)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting 13 September 1987, in the Province of Leoncio Prado and District of Chólon of the Province of Marañón (Department of Huánuco) and Provinces of Mariscal Cáceres and Tocache (Department of San Martín).

The armed forces will continue to exercise political and military control in the areas in question.

23 September 1987

(Dated 21 September 1987)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days starring from 21 September 1987 in the Provinces of Lima and Callao.

The notification specifies that with respect to article 21 of the Covenant, the prefuthority shall issue the appropriate regulations governing the exercise of the right of assembly, in accordance with the provisions of the said article.

9 October 1987

First notification

(Dated 3 October 1987)

Declaration of a state of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 23 September 1987 in the Provinces of Abancay, Aymares, Antabamba, Andahuaylas and Grau (Department of Apurímac).

Second notification

(Dated 5 October 1987)

Declaration of a state of emergency for a period of 60 days as of 5 October 1987 in the Provinces of Daniel Alcides Carrión and Pasco (Department of Pasco).

The armed forces shall continue to exercise political and military control of the areas in question.

4 November 1987

(Dated 23 October 1987)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days as of 21 October 1987 in the Provinces of Lima and Callao.

23 December 1987

(Dated 19 December 1987)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days as of 17 December 1987 in the Provinces of Lima and Callao.

22 January 1988

(Dated 20 January 1988)

First notification:

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days as of 16 January 1988 in the Provinces of Lima and Callao.

Second notification:

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days as of 17 January 1988 inthe following Provinces:

Department of Ayacucho (Provinces of Cangallo, Huamanga, Huanta, La Mar, Víctor Fajardo, Huancasancos, Vilcashuamán and Sucre);

Department of Huancavelica (Provinces of Acobamba, Angaraes, Huancavelica, Tayacaja, Huaytará and Churcampa);

Department of Apurimac (Province of Chincheros);

Department of Huánuco (Province of Ambo and District of Monzón of the Province of Huamaliés).

1 February 1988

(Dated 22 January 1988)

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 8 January 1988 in the following Provinces:

Provinoncio Prado and District of Cholón of the Province of Marañón (Department of Huánuco);

Provinces of Moyobamba, Bellavista, Huallaga, Lamas, Picota, Rioja, San Martín, Mariscal Cáceres and Tocache (Department of San Martín).

8 February 1988

(Dated 4 February 1988)

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 2 February 1988 in the Provinces of Daniel Alcides Carrillo and Pasco (Department of Pasco).

11 March 1988

(Dated 10 March 1988)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 9 March 1988 in the following Provinces:

Provinces of Moyobamba, Bellavista, Huallaga, Lamas, Picota, Rioja, San Martín, Mariscal Cáceres and Tocache (Department of San Martín);

Province of Leoncio Prado and District of Cholón of the Province of Marañón (Department of Huánuco).

29 March 1988

(Dated 21 March 1988)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 17 March 1988 in the following Provinces:

Provinces of Abancay, Aymares, Antabamba, Andahuaylas and Grau (Department of Apurímac).

8 April 1988

(Dated 4 April 1988)

Extension of the state ofemergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 2 April 1988, in the Provinces of Daniel Alcides Carrillo and Pasco (Department of Pasco).

19 April 1988

(Dated 21 March 1988)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days as of 15 April 1988, in the Provinces of Lima and Callao.

2 May 1988

(Dated 28 April 1988)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 20 days as of 27 April 1988 in the Province of Castrovirreyna (Department of Huancavelica).

23 May 1988

(Dated 19 May 1988)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days as of 15 May 1988 in the following Provinces:

Department of Ayacucho (Provinces of Cangallo, Huamanga, Huanta, La Mar, Victor Fajardo, Huancasancos, Vilcashuamán and Snt of Huancavelica (Provinces of Acobamba, Angaraes, Huancavelica, Tayacaja, Huaytara, Churcampa and Castrovirreyna);

Department of Apurimac (Provinces of Chincheros, Abancay, Aymares, Antabamba, Andahuaylas and Grau);

Department of Huánuco (Province of Ambo and District of Monzón of the Province of Huamaliés).

27 June 1988

(Dated 7 June 1988)

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 43 days starting 1 June 1988 in the Provinces of Daniel Alcides Carrión and Pasco (Department of Pasco).

(Dated 16 June 1988)

First notification:

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 30 days starting 15 June 1988 in the Provinces of Cotabambas (Department of Apurímac).

Second notification:

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 30 days starting 14 June 1988 in the Provinces of Lima and Callao.

Third notification:

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 29 days starting 15 June 1988 in the following Provinces:

Provinces of Moyobamba, Bellavista, Huallaga, Lamas, Picota, Rioja, San Martín, Mariscal Cáceres and Tocache (Department of San Martín);

Province of Marañón (Department of Huánuco).

22 July 1988

(Dated 19 July 1988)

First notification:

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 60 days starting 14 July 1988 in the Provinces of Lima and Callao.

Second notification:

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 60 days starting 14 July 1988 in the following Provinces:

Department of Apurímac;

Department of Huancavelica;

Department of San Martín;

Department of Ayacucho (Provinces of Cangallo, Huamanga, La Mar, Victor Fajardo, Huancasancos, Huanta, Vilcashuamán and Sucre);

Department of Huánuco (Provinces of Ambo and Leoncio Prado; Districts of Monzón of the Province of Huamalíes and Cholón of the Province of Marañón).

15 September 1988

(Dated 13 September 1988)

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 60 days startingthe following Provinces:

Department of Apurímac;

Department of Huancavelica;

Department of San Martín;

Department of Ayacucho (Provinces of Cangallo, Huamanga, La Mar, Victor Fajardo, Huancasancos, Huanta, Vilcashuamán and Sucre);

Pasco Department: Daniel Alcides Carrión and Pasco;

Department of Huánuco: Ambo and Leoncio Prado, District of Monzón (Province of Huamaliés) and District of Cholón (province of Marañón);

Department of Lima: Provinces of Lima and the constitutional province of Callao).

21 December 1988

(Dated 8 December 1988)

Extension of the state of emergency for sixty (60) days from [18 September 1988] in the provinces of Lucanas, Parinacochas and Páucar del Sara Sara in the Department of Ayacucho and the provinces of Pachitea, Huánuco, Dos de Mayo,Huamaliés and Marañon in the Department of Huánuco.

9 January 1989

(Dated 5 January 1989)

Extension of the state of emergency for sixty (60) days from 3 January 1989 in the Departments of Apurímac, Huancavelica, San Martín, Junín, Pasco, Ayacucho, Huánuco and Lima, the province of Lima and the constitutional province of Callao.

8 March 1989

(Dated 6 March 1989)

Extension of the state of emergency for sixty (60) days from 4 March 1989 in the following Departments and Provinces:

The Department of Apurímac (with the exception of the Province of Andahuaylas), the Departments of Huancavelica, San Martín, Junín, Pasco, Ayacucho, Huánuco and Lima, the province of Lima and the Constitutional Province of Callao.

4 August 1989

(Dated 2 August 1989)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days from 31 July 1989 in the Department of Ucayali and the Province of Ucayali-Contamaná of the Department of Loreto.

15 August 1989

(Dated 14 August 1989)

Proclamation of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days from 9 August 1989 in the Province of Huarochirí of the Department of Lima.

(Dated 7 June 1990)

Proclamation of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days, with effect from 31 May 1990, in the province of Lima, Department of Lima, and in the constitutional province of Callao.

Suspension of the individual rights provided for in articles 9 and 21 of the Covenant.

19 March 1992

Notification of declarations or extensions of the state of emergency which were made necessary by the continuing acts of violence caused by terrorist groups, leading to a climate of insecurity which endangered the normal performance of public and private activities. The articles of the Covenant which were derogated from are articles 9, 12, 17 and 21. The said declarations and extensions of the state of emergency were as follows:

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 26 August 1990 in Apurímac, Huancavelica, San Martín, Junín, Pasco, Ayacucho, Huánuco, Ucayali and in the Province of Ucayali of the Department of Loreto.
- Declaration for a period of 30 days as from 5 September 1990 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 26 September 1990 in the District of Yurimaguas and in the Department of Loreto.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 5 October 1990 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.
- Declaration for a period of 30 days as from 13 October 1990 in the Provinces of Melgar, Azángaro, Huancane and San Antonio de Putina of the Department of Puno.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 25 October 1990 in Apurímac, Huancavelica, San Martín, Junín, Pasco, Ayacucho (except the Province of Huamanga), Huánuco, Ucayali and in the Province of Ucayali of the Department of Loreto and the District of Quimbiri of the Province of Convención in the Department of Cuzco.
- Extension for a period of 30 days as from 25 November 1990 in the District of Yurimaguas, Province of Alto Amazonas, Department of Loreto.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 4 De0 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 24 December 1990 in Apurímac, Huancavelica, San Martín, Junín, Pasco, Ayacucho (except the Province of Huamanga), Huánuco, Ucayali and in the Province of Ucayali of the Department of Loreto and the District of Quimbiri of the Province of Convención in the Department of Cuzco and in the DistrictofYurimaguas of the Province of Alto Amazonas of the Department of Loreto.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 2 February 1991 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.
- Declaration for a period of 60 days as from 18 February 1991 in the Provinces of Azángaro, Lampa, Melgar, San Antonio de Putina and Huancané of the Department of Puno and in the Provinces of Caravelí, La Unión and Caylloma in the Department of Arequipa.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 22 February 1991 in Apurímac, Huancavelica, San Martín, Junín, Pasco, Ayacucho (except the Province of Huamanga), Huánuco, Ucayali and in the Province of Ucayali of the Department of Loreto and the District of Quimbiri of the Province of Convención in the Department of Cuzco and in the District of Yurimaguas of the Province of Alto Amazonas of the Department of Loreto.
- Declaration for 60 days as from 9 March 1991 in the Provinces of Chumbivilcas, Canas, Espinar and Canchis of the Region Inca.
- Declaration for 30 days as from 9 March 1991 in the Provinces of Ica, Chincha, Nazca, Pisco and Palpa of the Region Los Libertadores-Wari.

- Declaration for 60 days as from 12 March 1991 in the ports, terminals and wharfs (maritime, fluvial and lacustrine) of the Republic.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 3 April 1991 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.

- Extension for a period of 30 days as from 8 April 1991 in the Provinces of Ica, Chincha, Nazca, Pisco and Palpa of the Region Los Libertadores-Wari.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 19 April 1vinces of Azángaro, Lampa, Melgar, San Antonio de Putina and Huancané of the Department of Puno and in the Provinces of Caravelí, La Unión and Caylloma in the Department of Arequipa.

- Extension fora period of 60 days as from 23 April 1991 in Apurímac, Huancavelica, San Martín, Junín, Pasco, Ayacucho (except the Province of Huamanga), Huánuco and Ucayali, in the Province of Ucayali of the Department of Loreto, in the Districts of Quimbiri of the Province of Convención of the Department of Cuzco, Yurimaguas in the Province of Alto Amazonas of the Department of Loreto.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 8 May 1991 in the Provinces of Ica, Chincha, Nazca, Pisco and Palpa of the Region Los Libertadores-Wari.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 9 May 1991 in the Provinces of Chumbivilcas, Canas, Espinar and Canchis of the Region Inca.

- Declaration for a period of 60 days as from 21 May 1991 in the Provinces of Condesuyos and Castilla of the Region Arequipa.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 2 June 1991 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.

- Declaration for 60 days as from 18 June 1991 in the Provinces of Sandia and Carabaya of the Department of Puno.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 18 June 1991 in the Provinces of Azángaro, Lampa, Melgar, San Antonio de Putina and Huancané of the Department of Puno and in the Provinces of Caravelí, La Unión and Caylloma in the Department of Arequipa.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 22 June 1991 in Apurímac, Huancavelica, San Martín, Junín, Pasco, Ayacucho (except the Province of Huamanga), Huánuco and Ucayali, in the Province of Ucayali of the Department of Loreto, in the Districts of Quimbiri in the Province of Convención of the Department of Cuzco, Yurimaguas in the Province of Alto Amazonas of the Department of Loreto.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 4 July 1991 in the Provinces of Ica, Chincha, Nazca, Pisco and Palpa of the Reges-Wari.

- Declaration for 60 days as from 30 July 1991 in the Province of Convención except the District of Quimbiri which already is under the state of emergency, and in the Districts of Yanatili and Lares of the Province of Calca of the Department of Cuzco.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 1 August 1991 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.

- Declaration for 60 days as from 27 August 1991 in the Province of Convención (except the District of Quimbiri) and in the Districts of Yanatili and Lares of the Province of Calca of the Department of Cuzco.

- Declaration for 60 days as from 27 August 1991 in Huánuco (except the Province of Puerto Inca and District of Huacrachuco), San Martín and in the District of Yurimaguas of the Province of Alto Amazonas of the Department of Loreto.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 5 September 1991 in the Provinces of Ica, Chincha, Nazca, Pisco and Palpa of the Region Los Libertadores-Wari.

- Declaration for 60 days as from 18 September 1991 in Apurimac.

- Declaration for 60 days as from 28 September in Ucayali, the Province of Ucayali of the Department of Loreto and the Province of Puerto Inca of the Department of Huánuco.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 30 September 1991 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.

- Declaration for 60 days as from 28 September 1991 in the Province of Cajabamba of the Department of Cajamarca.

- Declaration for 30 days as from 26 September 1991 in the Provinces of Melgar, Azangare, Sandia and Carabaya of the Department of Puno.

- Declaration for 60 days as from 25 September 1991 in the Provinces of Chanchamayo, Satipo, in the Districts of Ulcumayo and Junín of the Province of Junín, in the District of Andamarca of the Province of Concepción, in the Districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca of the Province of Huancayo, in the Districts of San Pedro de Cajas, Palca and Huasahuasi of the Province of Tarma and in the Dof Monobamba of the Province of Jauja of the Department of Junín, in the Districts of Huachón and Paucartambo of the Province of Pasco, in the Districts of Chontabamba, Oxapampa and Villa Rica of the Province of Oxapampa of the Department of Pasco.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 26 October 1991 in the Province of Convención (except the District of Quimbiri) and in the Districts of Yanatili and Lares of the Province of Calca of the Department of Cuzco.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 26 October 1991 in Huánuco (except the Province of Puerto Inca and District of Huacrachuco), San Martín and in the District of Yurimaguas of the Province of Alto Mazanoas of the Department of Loreto.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 28 October 1991 in the Provinces of Chanchamayo, Satipo, in the Districts of Ulcumayo and Junín of the Province of Junín, in the Districts of Andamarca, Santa Rosa de Ocopa, Matahuasi, Mito, Nueve de Julio, Concepción and Orcotuna of the Province of Concepción, in the Districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba, Pariahuanca, Sapallanga, Chilca, Huancayo, Huamancaca Chico, Huayucachi, Tres de Diciembre, Pilcomayo, Huacan, Chupaca and Tambo of the Province of Huancayo, in the Districts of San Pedro de

Cajas, Palca and Huasahuasi and Tarma of the Province of Tarma and in the District of Monobamba, Sausa, Jauja, Yauyos, Huetas and Pancas of the Province of Jauja and in the Districts of Oroya and Morococha of the Province of Yauli of the Department of Junín, in the Districts of Huachón, Paucartambo and Chaupimarca of the Province of Pasco, in the Districts of Chontabamba, Oxapampa and Villa Rica of the Province of Oxapampa of the Department of Pasco.

- Extension for a period of 30 days from 28 October 1991 in the Provinces of Melgar, Azángaro and Sandia of the Department of Puno.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 4 November 1991 in the Provinces of Ica, Chincha, Nazca, Pisco and Palpa of the Region Los Libei.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 17 November 1991 in Apurímac.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 27 November 1991 in the Department of Ucayali, in the Province of Ucayali of the Department of Loreto and in the the Province of Puerto Inca of the Department of Huánuco.

- Extension for a period of 30 days as from 27 November 1991 in the Province of Azangaro of the Department of Puno.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 29 November 1991 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 25 December 1991 in Huánuco (except the Province of Puerto Inca and District of Huacrachuco), San Martín and in the District of Yurimaguas of the Province of Alto Mazanoas of the Department of Loreto.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 25 December 1991 in the Province of Convención (except the District of Quimbiri) and in the Districts of Yanatili and Lares of the Province of Calca of the Department of Cuzco.

- Extension for a period of 30 days as from 27 December 1991 in the Province of Azangaro of the District of Puno.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 27 December 1991 in the Provinces of Chanchamayo, Satipo, in the Districts of Ulcumayo and Junín of the Province of Junín, in the Districts of Andamarca, Santa Rosa de Ocopa, Matahuasi, Mito, Nueve de Julio, Concepción and Orcotuna of theProvince of Concepción, in the Districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba, Partahuanca, Sapallanga, Chilca, Huancayo, Huamancaca Chico, Huayucachi, Tres de Diciembre, Pilcomayo, Huacan, Chupaca and Tambo of the Province of Huancayo, in the Districts of San Pedro de Cajas, Palca, Huasahuasi and Tarma of the Province of Tarma and in the District of Monobamba, Sausa, Jauja, Yauyos, Huertas and Pancas of the Province of Jauja and in the Districts of Oroya and Morococha of the Province of Yauli of the Department of Junín, in the Districts of Huachón, Paucartambo and Chanpimarca of the Province of Pe Districts of Chontabamba, Oxapampa and Villa Rica of the Province of Oxapampa of the Department of Pasco.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 3 January 1992 in the Provinces of Ica, Chincha, Nazca, Pisco and Palpa of the Region Los Libertadores-Wari.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 16 January 1992 in Apurímac.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 26 January 1992 in the Department of Ucayali, in the Province of Ucayali of the Department of Loreto and in the Province of Puerto Inca of the Department of Huánuco.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 28 January 1992 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.

- Declaration for 30 days as from 21 January 1992 in the Province of Danel Carrión, in the Districts of Huancabamba, Palcazu, Pozuzo and Puerto Bermudes of the Province of Oxapampa and in the Districts of Huariaca, Huayllay, Hinacaca, Pallanchacra, San Francisco de Assis, Simón Bolivar, Tillacayas, Tinyahuarco, Vicco and Yanacancha of the Province of Pasco of the Department of Pasco.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 23 February 1992 in Huánuco (except the Province of Puerto Inca and the District of Huacrachuco),San Martín and in the District of Yurimaguas of the Province of Alto Amazonas of the Department of Loreto.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 23 February 1992 in the Province of Convención (except the District of Quimbiri) and in the Districts of Yanatili and Lares of the Province of Calca of the Department of Cuzco.

- Declaration for 60 days as from 25 February 1992 in the provinces of Malgar and Azangaro of the Department of Puno.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 25 February 1992 in the Provinces of Pasco and Daniel Carrión of the Department of Pasco and in the Provinces of Huancayo, Concepción, Jauja, Satipo and Chanchamayo of the Department of Junín.

- Declaration for 60 days as from 25 February 1992 in the Provinces of Castrovirreyna, Huaytara and Huancavelicepartment of Huancavelica and in the Provinces of Lucanas, Huamanga and Cangallo of the Department of Ayacucho.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 16 March 1992 in Apurímac.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 26 March 1992 in the Provinces of Coronel Portillo and Padre Abad of the Department of Ucayali, in the Province of Ucayali of the Department of Loreto and in the Province of Puerto Inca of the Department of Huánuco.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 28 March 1992 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.

10 April 1992

A Framework Law relating to the Government of Emergency and National Reconstruction has been established by Decree Law No. 25418 of 6 April 1992. A Manisfesto to the Nation of 5 April 1992 by the President of the Republic is deemed to form part of the Decree.

This measure became necessary due to Parliament's inability to function together with the obvious obstructionist tactics and hidden conspirationalmethods of the partisan elites which are thwarting the efforts of the people and the Government. The Government indicated also other reasons such as terrorism and the fight against drug trafficking.

(The articles of the Convention which are being derogated from under the above-mentioned Decree have been requested from the Government of Peru.)

9 February, 22 May and 23 October 1995

The Government of Peru notified, under article 4 (3) of the Covenant, that it had declared, lifted or extended the state of emergency in a number of departments, provinces and districts of Peru indicating that the measures were prompted by the persistence of acts of violence caused by terrorist groups and drug traffickers, who are fomenting a climate of insecurity that threatens the normal conduct of public and private activities. The Government of Peru specified that the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant. *[For reasons of economy and size, it willt be possible to include the texts of all the notifications concerning the states of emergencies as declared, lifted or extended. For a comprehensive list of these actions, see depositary notification C.N.460.1995. TREATIES-13 of 10 February 1996.]*

8 February, 6 May, 29 August, 5 November, 4 and 30 December 1996

Extensions of the states of emergencies in a number of departments, provinces and districts of Peru. *[For a comprehensive list of these actions, see depositary notification C.N.451.1996.TREATIES-10 of 10 February 1997 and C.N.459.1996.TREATIES-11 of 28 February 1997.]*

30 December 1996

Establishment of the state of emergency as from 18 December 1996 for a 60-day period in the Department of Lima and the Constitutional Province of Callao.The Government of Peru indicated that the measures were prompted by the occurence of subversive actions which have caused a civil disturbance and by the need to take corrective measures for the purposes of the process of pacification in this area of the country. The provisions from which the Government of Peru has derogated are article 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant.

6 February 1997

Extension for a period of sixty (60) days, as from 3 February 1997, of the state of emergency in the Oxapampa province of the department of Pasco; the Satipo and Chanchamayo provinces of the department of Junín; the Huancavelica, Castrovirreyna and Huaytara provinces of the department of Huancavelica; the Huamanga, Cangallo and La Mar provinces of the department of Ayacucho; and the Quimbiri and Pichari districts of the La Convención province of the department of Cuzco;

Extension for a period of sixty (60) days, as from 3 February 1997, of the state of emergency in the Chinceros province of the department of Apurímac.

4 January 2000

Establishment and extension of the State of emergency in various districts, provinces and departments of Peru, indicating that the measures were prod by the persistence this year of instances of civil unrest. *[For a comprehensive list of these actions, see depositary notification C.N.43.2000.TREATIES-1 of 1 February 2000.]*

Furthermore, the Government of Peru specifed that the provisions from which it had derogated were articles 12, 17, 21 and 29 of the Covenant.

2 March 2000

Extension of the state of emergency in several provinces of Peru during the months of January and February 2000, indicating that the measures were prompted by (in respect of Decree Nos 001, 002 and 003) the persistence of civil unrest andby the need to complete the process of pacification in these areas of the country and (in respect of Decree No. 003) in particular in order to ensure the rational use of natural resources, particularly timber in the area of Tahuamanú Province of the department of Madre de Dios. Furthermore, the Government of Peru specified that the provisions from which it had derogated were articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant.

[For a recapitulative table of the Decrees by which a state of emergency was extended in various provinces, see depositary notification C.N.215.2000.TREATIES-3 of 28 April 2000.]

26 July 2000

(Dated 25 July 2000)

By Supreme Decree No. 015-2000-PCM dated 30 June 2000, establishment of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days as of 4 July 2000 in the district of Iñapari, Tahuamanu Province, Department of Madre de Dios. The said Decree stipulates that this measure was necessary to protect citizens, ensuring peace and internal order in view of the presence of subversive armed groups.

The Government of Peru specified that the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant.

18 June 2002

By Supreme Decree No. 052-2002-PCM of 16 June 2002, establishment of the state of emergency in the department of Arequipa, in the south of the country for a period of 30 days, with the suspension in thatgion of the rights relating to inviolability of domicile, freedom of movemnt and freedom of assembly and to liberty and security of person provided for in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), respectively, of the Political Constitution of Peru.

25 June 2002

Transmission of Decree No. 054-2002-PCM dated 21 June 2002, which revokes the state of emergency declared by thePeruvian Government in the Department of Arequipa.

30 May 2003

Transmission of Supreme Decree No. 055-2003-PCM dated 27 May 2003, which establishes the state of emergency throughout the national territory for a period of 30 days.

The Government of Peru specified that the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant.

27 June 2003

Transmission of Supreme Decree No. 062-2003-PCM of 25 June 2003, which lifts the the state of emergency in the national territory, except in the departments of Junín, Ayacucho and Apurimac and the province of La Convención , department of Cusco, where the state of emergency is extended for a period of 30 days.

The Government of Peru specified that during the extension of the state of emergency, the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant.

10 September 2003

Transmittion of Supreme Decree No. 077-2003-PCM of 27 August 2003, which declared a state of emergency for 30 days, and Supreme Decision No. 289-DE/SG of 27 August 2003.

The Government of Peru specified that during the state of emergency, the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant.

30 September 2003

Transmission of Supreme Decree No. 083-2003-PCM of 25 September 2003, which extended a state of emergency for a period of 60 days, and Supreme Decision No. 335-DE/SG of 25 September 2003.

The Government of Peru specified that during the state of emergency, the provisions from which it has derogated are artles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant

1 December 2003

On 1 December 2003, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting Supreme Decree No. 093-2003-PCM of 26 November 2003, which extended a state of emergency for a period of 60 days, and Supreme Decision No. 474-2003-DE/SG of 26 November 2003.

The Government of Peru specified that during the state of emergency, the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant.

27 January 2004

On 27 January 2004, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting Supreme Decree No. 003-2004-PCM of 23 January 2004, which extended a state of emergency for a period of 60 days, and Supreme Decision No. 021-2004-DE/SG of 23 January 2004.

The Government of Peru specified that during the state of emergency, the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant.

30 March 2004

On 30 March 2004, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification, made under article 4 (3) of the Covenant, transmitting Supreme Decree No. 025-2004-PCM of 24 March 2004, which extended a state of emergency for a period of 60 days, and Supreme Decision No. 133-2004-DE/SG of 24 March 2004.

The Government of Peru specified that during the state of emergency, the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant.

13 May 2004

On 13 May 2004, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification, made under article 4 (3) of the Covenant, transmitting Supreme Decree No. 028-2004-PCM of 6 April 2004, which extended a state of emergency for a period of 60 days and Supreme Decree No. 010-2004-PCM of 5 February 2004 by which the original state of emergency was established.

2 June 2004

On 2 June 2004, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting Supreme Decree No. 039-2004-PCM of 20 May 2004, which extended a state of emergency for a period of 60 days, and Supreme Decision No. 218-2004-DE/SG of 20 May 2004.

The Government of Peru specified that during the state of emergency, the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant.

5 August 2004

On 5 August 2004, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting Supreme Decree No. 056-2004-PCM of 22 July 2004, which extended a state of emergency for a period of 60 days.

The Government of Peru specified that during the state of emergency, the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant.

28 October 2004

On 28 October 2004, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting Supreme Decree No. 071-2004-PCM of 19 October 2004 and Supreme Decree No. 072-2004-PCM of 20 October 2004, which declared a state of emergency in the districts of San Gabán, Ollachea and Ayapara, province of Carabaya, and the district of Antauta, province of Melgar, in the department of Puno.

The Government of Peru specified that during the state of emergency, the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant.

16 November 2004

On 16 November 2004, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting Supreme Decree No. 076-2003-PCM of 6 November 2004, which declared a state of emergency in the province of Alto Amazonas, department of Loreto, for a period of 30 days.

The Government of Peru specified that during te state of emergency, the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant.

23 November 2004

On 23 November 2004, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting Supreme Decree No. 081- 2004-PCM of 20 November 2004, which declared that the state of emergency has been ended in the provinces of Andahuaylas and Chincheros, department of Apurímac. At the same time, the state of emergency has been extended for 60 days in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; in the province of Tayacaja, department of Hauncavelica; in the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; and in the province of Satipo, the district of Andamarca, province of Concepción, and the district of Santo Domingo de Acobamba, province of Hauncayo, in the department of Junín.

The Government of Peru specified that during the state of emergency, the constitutional rights recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru are being suspended.

2 December 2004

On 2 December 2004, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting Supreme Decree No. 082-2004-PCM, issued on 23 November 2004, which declared that the state of emergency in the districts of San Gában, Ollachea and Ayapara, province of Carabaya, and the district of Antauta, province of Melgar, department of Puno, has been extended until 31December 2004.

The Government of Peru specified that during the state of emergency, the rights contained in articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant shall remain suspended.

26 January 2005

On 26 January 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting Supreme Decree No. 001-2005-PCM, issued onuary 2005, which declared a state of emergency in the department of Apurimac for a period of 30 days.

The Government of Peru specified that during the state of emergency, the rights contained in articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant shall be suspended.

27 January 2005

On 27 January 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting Supreme Decree No. 003-2005-PCM, issued on 20 January 2005, which extended the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho, the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica, the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; in the province of Satipo, in the district of Andamarca, province of Concepcíon, and in the district of Santo Domingo de Acobamba, province of Huancayo, department of Junín, for a period of 60 days.

The government of Peru specified that during the state of emergency, the rights contained in articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant shall be suspended.

31 March 2005

On 31 March 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting Supreme Decree No. 022-2005-PCM, issued on 19 March 2005, which extended the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar,department of Ayacucho, the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica, the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; in the province of Satipo, in the district of Andamarca, province of Concepcíon, and in the district of Santo Domingo de Acobamba, province of Huancayo, department of Junín, for a period of 60 days.

The Government of Peru specified that during the state of emergency, the rights contained in articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant shall be suspended.

8 April 2005

On 8 April 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification mder article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting Decree No. 028-2005-PCM, published on 3 April 2005, which declared a state of emergency in the provinces of Andahuaylas and Chincheros, department of Apurímac, for a period of 30 days.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of domicile, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and freedom of personal security, recognized in articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant are suspended.

24 May 2005

On 24 May 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting Supreme Decree No. 038-2005-PCM, published on 21 May 2005, which extended the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho, the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica, the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; in the province of Satipo, in the district of Andamarca, province of Concepción, and in the district of Santo Domingo de Acobamba, province of Huancayo, department of Junín, for a period of 60 days.

The Government of Peru specified that during the state of emergency, the rights contained in articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant shall be suspended.

21 July 2005

On 21 July 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting Supreme Decree No. 049-2005-PCM, published on 18 July 2005, which extended the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho, the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica, the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; in the province of Satipo, in the district of Andamarca, province of Concepción, and in the district of Santo Domingo de Acobamba, province of Huancayo, department of Junín, for a period of 60 days.

The Government of Peru specified that during the state of emergency, the rights contn article 2 (9), (11), (12) and (24.f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the Covenant shall be suspended.

20 September 2005

On 20 September 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting Decree

No. 068-2005-PCM, published on 13 September 2005, which extended the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho, the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica, the province of La Convención, department of Cusco, the province of Satipo, Andamarca district of the province of Concepción, and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba district of the province of Huancayo, department of Junín, for a period of 60 days.

The Government of Peru specified that during the state of emergency, the rights contained in article 2 (9), (11), (12) and (24.f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the Covenant shall be suspended.

1 December 2005

On 1 December 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting Supreme Decree No. 089-2005-PCM, published on 18 November 2005, which extended the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho, the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica, the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; in the province of Satipo, in the district of Andamarca, province of Concepción, and in the district of Santo Domingo de Acobamba, province of Huancayo, department of Junín, for a period of 60 days.

The Government of Peru specified that during the state of emergency, the rights contained in article 2 (9), (11), (12) and (24.f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the Covenant shall be suspended.

23 December 2005

On 23 December 2005, the Secreeneral received from the Government of Peru a notification made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting Supreme Decree No. 098-2005-PCM, issued on 22 December 2005, which extended the state of emergency in the provinces of Marañón, Huacaybamba, Leoncio Prado and Huamalíes, department of Huánuco, the province of Tocache, department of San Martín, and the province of Padre Abad, department of Ucayali, for a period of 60 days.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of association and liberty and security of person, enshrined in article 2 (9), (11), (12) and (24) (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively,shallbe suspended.

18 January 2006

On 18 January 2006, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification made under article 4 of the above Covenant, transmitting Supreme Decree No. 001-2006-PCM, issued on 14 January 2006, which extended the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; the province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; the province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; and the province of Satipo, the Andamarca district of the province of Concepción and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba district of the province of Huancayo, Department of Junín, for a period of 60 days as from 15 January 2006.

The Government of Peru specified that during the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, liberty of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized, respectively, in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, shall be suspended.

22 February 2006

On 22 February 2006, the Secretary-General receivehe Government of Peru a notification made under article 4 of the above Covenant, transmitting Supreme Decree No. 006-2006-PCM, issued on 18 February 2006, which extended the state of emergency in the provinces of Marañón, Huacaybamba, Leoncio Prado and Huamalíes, department of Huánuco, the province of Tocache, department of San Martín and the province of Padre Abad, department of Ucayalli for sixty days.

During the state of emergency, the rights of inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of association and liberty and security of the person, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

17 March 2006

On 17 March 2006, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Peru a notification made under article 4 of the above Covenant, transmitting Supreme Decree No. 011-2006-PCM, issued on 15 March 2006, which extended the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho, the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica, the province of La Convención, department of Cusco, the province of Satipo, Andamarca district of the province of Concepción and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba district of the province of Huancayo, department of Junín for a period pf sixty days, beginning 16 March 2006. During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of association and liberty and security of the person, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

26 April 2006

..by Supreme Decree No. 019-2006-PCM, issued on 19 April 2006, the state of emergency in the provinces of Marañón, Huacaybamba, Ldo and Huamalíes, department of Huánuco, the province of Tocache, department of San Martín and the province of Padre Abad, department of Ucayali, has been extended for sixty days. A previous extension was transmitted by Note 7-1-SG/05 of 22 February 2006.

During the state of emergency, the rights of inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of association and libertyand security of the person, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

5 July 2006

... by Supreme Decree No. 030-2006-PCM, issued on 17 June 2006 [...], the state of emergency in the provinces of Marañón, Huacaybamba, Leoncio Prado and Huamalíes, department of Huánuco, the province of Tocache, department of San Martín and the province of Padre Abad, department of Ucayalli, has been extended for sixty days. A previous extension was transmitted by Note 7-1-SG/010 of 25 April 2006.

During the state of emergency, the rights of inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of association and liberty and security of the person, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

27 September 2006

... by Supreme Decree No. 059-2006-PCM, issued on 22 September 2006 [...], the state of emergency in the Provinces of Huanta and La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; the Province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; and the Province of Satipo, the Andamarca district of the Province of Concepción and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba district of the Province of Huancayo, Department of Junín, has been extended for 60 days as from 27 September 2006.

During themergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, liberty of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized, respectively, in article 2, paragraphs 9,11, 12and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political rights, shall be suspended.

20 October 2006

... by Supreme Decree No. 067-2006-PCM, published on 13 October 2006, a state of emergency has been declared in the province of Chiclayo, department of Lambayeque, for a period of 60 days. During the state of emergency, the rights to personal freedom and security, inviolability of the home and freedom of movement, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 24 (f), 9 and 11, of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 9, 17 and 12 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended.

23 October 2006

... by Supreme Decree No. 069-2006-PCM, issued on 17 October 200, the state of emergency in the provinces of Marañón, Huacaybamba, Leoncio Prado and Huamalíes, department of Huánuco; the province of Tocache, department of San Martín; and the province of Padre Abad, department of Ucayali, has been extended for 60 days. A previous extension was communicated in note No. 7-1-SG/023 of 3 July 2006.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and personal freedom and security, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended.

26 October 2006

... by Supreme Decree No. 072-2006-PCM, published on 20 October 2006, the terms of the declaration of the state of emergency in the province of Chiclayo, department of Lambayeque, communicated via note No. 7-1/SG/0 17 October 2006, have been amended.

Accordingly, during the state of emergency, the rights to personal freedom and security, which are recognized in article 2, paragraph 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in article 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, will be suspended.

1 December 2006

... by Supreme Decree No. 085-2006-PCM, issued on 23 November 2006 [...], the state of emergency in the Provinces of Huanta and La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; in the Province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; in the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; in the Province of Satipo, Andamarca District of the Province of Concepción; and in the Santo Domingo de Acobamba District of the Province of Huancayo, Department of Junín, has been extended for 60 days as from 26 November 2006.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

12 December 2006

... by Supreme Decree No. 086-2006-PCM, published on 6 December 2006, a state of emergency has been declared in the province Abancay, department of Apurimac, for a period of 30 days, as from that date.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, provided for in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru, and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, have been suspended.

PORTUGAL

Note 1.

On 18 November 1999, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Portugal, the following communication:

"In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the Portuguese Republic and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Macau signed on 13 April 1987, the

Portuguese Republic will continue to have international respsnsibility for Macau until 19 December 1999 and from that date onwards the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau with effect from 20 December 1999.

From 20 December 1999 onwards the Portuguese Republic will cease to be responsible for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of [Conventions] to Macau."

See also note 3 under "China".

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Note 1.

By a communication dated 24 December 1991, the President of the Russian Federation notified the Secretary-General that membership of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) in the United Nations is being continued by the Russian Federation.

The Government of the Russian Federation subsequently informed the Secretary-General that as at 24 December 1991, the Russian Federation maintains full responsibility for all the rights and obligations of the USSR under the Charter of the United Nations and multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General and requested that the name "Russian Federation" be used in the United Nations in place of the name "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics".

SERBIA

Note 1.

As from 3 June 2006: "Serbia". Formerly: "Serbia and Montenegro" until 2 June 2006.

The Republic of Serbia continued the membership of Serbia and Montenegro in the United Nations, including all organs and organizations of the United Nations system, on the basis of Article 60 of the Constitutional Charter of Serbia and Montenegro, activated by the Declaration of Independence adopted by the National Assembly of Montenegro on 3 June 2006. Accordingly, by a letter dated 3 June 2006, the President of the Republic of Serbia notified the Secretary-General that "membership of the state union of Serbia and Montenegro is continued by the Republic of Serbia in the United Nations, including all organs and organizations of the United Nations system...".

Subsequently, in a letter dated 16 June 2006, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Serbia informed the Secretary-General that "the Republic of Serbia continues to exercise its rights and honour its commitments deriving from international treaties concluded by Serbia and Montenegro. Therefore, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs requests that the Republic of Serbia be considered a party to all international agreements in force, instead of Serbia and Montenegro. Furthermore, the Government of the Republic of Serbia will perform the functions formerly performed by the Council of ministers of the state union of Serbia and Montenegro as depositary for the corresponding multilateral treaties." Moreover, in a letter dated 30 June 2006, the Minister for Foreign Affaires of the Republic of Serbia confirmed that "all treaty actions undertaken by Serbia and Montenegro will continue in force with respect to the Republic of Serbia with effect from 3 June 2006. Therefore, all declarations, reservations and notifications made by Serbia and Montenegro will be maintained by the Republic of Serbia until the Secretary-General, as depositary, is duly notified otherwise."

See "Montenegro" and "Serbia and Montenegro"

SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO

Note 1.

As from 4 February 2003 until 2 June 2006. Formerly: "Yugoslavia" until 3 February 2003.

See also "Montenegro", "Serbia" and "Yugoslavia" .

SLOVAKIA

Note 1.

In a letter dated 19 May 1993 and also accompanied by a list of multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General, received by the Secretary-General on 28 May 1993, the Government of the Slovak Republic notified that:

"In accordance with the relevant principles and rules of international law and to the extent defined by it, the Slovak Republic, as a successor State, born from the dissolution of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, considers itself bound, as of January 1, 1993, i.e., the date on which the Slovak Republic assumed responsibility for its international relations, by multilateral treaties to which the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic was a party as of 31 December 1992, including reservations and declarations made earlier by Czechoslovakia, as well as objections by Czechoslovakia to reservations formulated by other treaty-parties.

The Slovak Republic wishes further to maintain its status as a contracting State of the treaties to which Czechoslovakia was a contracting State and which were not yet in force at the date of the dissolution of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, as well as the status of a signatory State of the treaties which were previously signed but not ratified by Czechoslovakia as listed in the Annex to this letter."

In view of the information above, entries in status lists pertaining to formalities (i.e., signatures, ratifications, accessions, declarations and reservations, etc.) effected by the former Czechoslovakia prior to dissolution, in respect of treaties to which the Czech Republic and/or Slovakia have succeeded, will be replaced by the name of "Czech Republic" and/or "Slovakia" with the corresponding date of deposit of the notification of succession. A footnote will indicate the date and type of formality effected by the former Czechoslovakia, the corresponding indicator being inserted next to "Czech Republic" and "Slovakia" as the case may be.

As regards treaties in respect of which formalities wereeffected by the former Czechoslovakia and not listed in the notification of succession by either the Czech Republic or Slovakia, a footnote indicating the date and type of formality effected by the former Czechoslovakia will be included in the status of the treaties concerned, the corresponding footnote indicator being inserted next to the heading "Participant".

See also note 1 under "Czech Republic".

For information on the treatment of treaty actions by predecessor States and successor States in the status tables, see Part C, "Status tables" of the "Introduction" to this publication.

Slovenia

Note 1.

In a letter dated 1 July 1992, received by the Secretary-General on the same date and accompanied by a list of multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General, the Government of the Republic of Slovenia notified that:

"When declaring independence on 25 June, 1991 the Parliament of the Republic of Slovenia determined that international treaties which had been concluded by the SFRY [Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia] and which related to the Republic of Slovenia remained effective on its territory (Article 3 of the Constitutional Law on the implementation of the Constitutional Charter on the Independence and Sovereignty of the Republic of Slovenia…). This decision was taken in consideration of customary international law and of the fact that the Republic of Slovenia, as a former constituent part of the Yugoslav Federation, had granted its agreement to the ratification of the international treaties in accordance with the then valid constitutional provisions.

The Republic of Slovenia therefore in principle acknowledges the continuity of treaty rights and obligations under the international treaties concluded by the SFRY before 25 June 1991, but since it is likely that certain treaties may have lapsed by the date of independence of Slovenia or may be outdated, it seems essential that each treaty be subjected to legal examination.

The Government of the Republic of Slovenia has examined 55 multilateral treaties for which [the Secretary-General of the United Nations] …has assumed the depositary functions. …[T]he Republic of Slovenia considers to be bound by these treaties by virtue of succession to the SFR Yugoslavia in respect of the territory of the Republic of Slovenia…

Other treaties, for which the Secretary-General of the United Nations is the depositary and which had been ratified by the SFRY, have not yet been examined by the competent authorities of the Republic of Slovenia. [The Government of the Republic of Slovenia] wim [the Secretary-General] …on [its] …position concerning these treaties in due course."

See also "former Yugoslavia".

For information on the treatment of treaty actions by predecessor States and successor States in the status tables, see Part C, "Status tables" of the "Introduction" to this publication.

South Africa

Note 1.

Formerly: "Union of South Africa" until 31 May 1961.

Sri Lanka

Note 1.

Formerly: "Ceylon" until 29 August 1972.

St. Kitts and Nevis

Note 1.

Formerly: "Saint Christopher and Nevis" until 28 December 1986.

Suriname

Note 1.

Formerly: "Surinam" until 23 January 1978.

Syria

See note 1 under "United Arab Republic".

The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Note 1.

The Government of The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia deposited with the Secretary-General notifications of succession to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to various treaties with effect from 17 September 1991, the date on which it assumed responsibility for its international relations.

See also note 1 under "Greece"and note 1 under "former Yugoslavia".

For information on the treatment of treaty actions by predecessor States and successor States in the status tables, see Part C, "Status tables" of the "Introduction" to this publication.

Tokelau Islands

See note 1 under "New Zealand".

Uganda

Note 1.

Re: Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs: In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 15 February 1972, the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Republic of Uganda to the United Nations informed him of the following:

"It is the understanding of the Government of the Republic of Uganda that in ratifying the said Convention, the Government of Portugal did not purport to act on behalf of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau which are distinct and separate political entities for which Portugal lacks any legal, moral or political capacity to represent."

In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 25 April 1972, the Permanent Representative of

Portugal to the United Nations informed him as follows with respect to the above-mentioned communication:

"The Government of Portugal is surprised that communications containing meaningless statements such as that from the Chargé d'Affaires of Uganda should be circulated, since they show clear ignorance of the fact that Portugal was admitted to the membership of the United Nations with the territorial composition that it has today, and including Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea."

UKRAINE

Note 1.

Formerly: "Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic" until 23 August 1991.

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Note 1.

By a communication dated 24 February 1958, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic notified the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the establishment by Egypt and Syria of a single State, the United Arab Republic. Subsequently, in a note dated 1 March 1958, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic informed the Secretary-General of the following: "... It is to be noted that the Government of the United Arab Republic declares that the Union henceforth is a single Member of the United Nations, bound by the provisions of the Charter and that all international treaties and agreements concluded by Egypt or Syria with other countries will remain valid within the regional limits prescribed on their conclusion and in accordance with the principles of international law."

In a cable dated 8 October 1961, the Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic informed the President of the General Assembly of the United Nations that Syria had resumed her former status as an independent State and requested that the United Nations take note of the resumed membership in the United Nations of the Syrian Arab Republic. This request was brought to the attention of Member States by the President of the General Assembly at its 1035th plenary meeting on 13 October 1961. At the 1036th plenary meeting which took place on the same date, the President of the General Assembly stated that no objection having been received on the part of any Member State the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic has taken its seat in the Assembly as a Member of the United Nations with all the obligations and rights that go with that status. In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 19 July 1962, the Permanent Representative of Syria to the United Nations communicated to him the text of decret-loi No. 25 promulgated by the President of the Syrian Arab Republic on 13 June 1962 and stated the following:

"It follows from article 2 of the text in question that obligations contracted by the Syrian Arab Republic under multilateral agreements and conventions during the period of the Union with Egypt remain in force in Syria. The period of the Union between Syria and Egypt extends from 22 February 1958 to 27 September 1961."

Finally, in a communication dated 2 September 1971, the Permanent Representative of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the United Nations informed the Secretary-General that the United Arab Republic had assumed the name of Arab Republic of Egypt (Egypt), and, in a communication dated 13 September 1971, the Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic stated that the official name of Syria was "Syrian Arab Republic".

Accordingly, in so far as concerns any action taken by Egypt or subsequently by the United Arab Republic in respect of any instrument concluded under the auspices of the United Nations, the date of such action is shown in the list of States opposite the name of Egypt. The dates of actions taken by Syria prior to the formation of the United Arab Republic are shown opposite the name of the Syrian Arab Republic, as also are the dates of receipt of instrument of accession or notification of application to the Syrian Province deposited on behalf of the United Arab Republic during the time when the Syrian Arab Republic formed part of the United Arab Republic.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Note 1.

The Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland was dissolved immediately before 1 January 1964. In reply to the Secretariat's inquiry as to the legal effect of that dissolution, in so far as concerns the application in the territories formerly constituting the Federation, i.e., Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland and Southern Rhodesia, of certain multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General which had been extended by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the Federation or to any of the territories concerned prior to the formation of the Federation, and of the International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material done at Geneva on 7 November 1952 (see chapter XI.A.5), to which the Federation acceded in its capacity of a Contracting Party to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (see chapter X.1), the Government of the United Kingdom in a communication received on 16 April 1964, provided the following clarification:

"Her Majesty's Government consider that in general, multilateral treaties applicable to the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland continued to apply to the constituent territories of the former Federation on its dissolution. Multilateral treaties under which the Federation enjoyed membership of international organisations fall in a special category; their continued application to the constituent territories of the former Federation depends in each case on the terms of the treaty. Her Majesty's Government regard all the conventions listed in the Secretariat's letter of February 26 as applying to the constituent territories of the former Federation since its dissolution, but the accession by the Federation to the

International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material has not led to this result as Article XIII of the Convention allows Her Majesty's Government to extend provisions of the Convention to te three constituent territories of the former Federation if considered desirable.

"With regard to the final query by the Secretariat, I am to reply that extensions prior to the inauguration of the Federation do, of course, continue to apply to the constituent territories."

Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland and Southern Rhodesia have since become independent States under the names of Zambia, Malawi, and Zimbabwe, respectively.

Note 2.

On 10 June 1997, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General of the following:

"In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong signed on 19 December 1984, the Government of the United Kingdom will restore Hong Kong to the People's Republic of China with effect from 1 July 1997. The Government of the United Kingdom will continue to have international responsibility for Hong Kong until that date. Therefore, from that date the Government of the United Kingdom will cease to be responsible for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of [Conventions] to Hong Kong."

See also note 2 under "China".

UNITED NATIONS (INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL TRIBUNAL FOR THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA)

Note 1.

The former Yugoslavia was an original Member of the United Nations, the Charter having been signed and ratified on its behalf on 26 June 1945, and 19 October 1945, respectively. The following republics constituting the former Yugoslavia declared their independence on the dates indicated: Slovenia (25 June 1991), The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (17 September 1991), Croatia (8 October 1991), and Bosnia and Herzegovina (6 March 1992). Yugoslavia came into being on 27 April 1992 following the promulgation of the constitution of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on that day. Yugoslavia nevertheless advised the Secretary-General on 27 April 1992 that it claimed to continue the international legal personality of the former Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia accordingly claimed to be a member of those international organizations of which the former Yugoslavia had been a member. It also claimed that all those treaty acts that had been performed by the former Yugoslavia were directly attributable to it, as being the same State (See documents S/23877 and A/46/915). Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia and The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, all of which had applied for and were admitted to membership in the United Nations, in accordance with Article 4 of the Charter (by resolutions 46/237 adopted on 22 May 1992, 46/238 adopted on 22 May 1992, 46/236 adopted on 22 May 1992, and 47/225 adopted on 8 April 1993 respectively), objected to this claim.

In its resolution 47/1 of 22 September 1992, the General Assembly, acting upon the recommendation of the Security Council in its resolution 777 (1992) of 19 September 1992, considered that Yugoslavia could not continue automatically the membership of the former Yugoslavia in the United Nations, and decided that it should accordingly apply for membership in the Organization. It also decided that Yugoslavia could not participate in the work of the General Assembly. The Legal Counsel took the view, hower, that this resolution of the General Assembly neither terminated nor suspended the membership of the former Yugoslavia in the United Nations. At the same time, the Legal Counsel expressed the view that the admission of a new Yugoslavia to membership in the United Nations, in accordance with Article 4 of the Charter of the United Nations, would terminate the situation that had been created by General Assembly resolution 47/1 (See document A/47/485). General Assembly resolution 47/1 did not specifically address the question of the status of either the former Yugoslavia or of Yugoslavia with regard to multilateral treaties that were deposited with the Secretary-General. The Legal Counsel took the view in this regard that the Secretary-General was not in a position, as depositary, either to reject or to disregard the claim of Yugoslavia that it continued the legal personality of the former Yugoslavia, absent any decision to the contrary either by a competent organ of the United Nations directing him in the exercise of his depositary functions, or by a competent treaty organ created by a treaty, or by the contracting States to a treaty directing him in the exercise of his depositary functions with regard to that particular treaty, or by a competent organ representative of the international community of States as a whole on the general issue of continuity and discontinuity of statehood to which the claim of Yugoslavia gave rise.

Consistent with the claim of Yugoslavia to continue the international legal personality of the former Yugoslavia, the Secretary-General, as depositary, continued to list treaty actions that had been performed by the former Yugoslavia in status lists in the present publication, using for that purpose the short-form name "Yugoslavia", which was used at that time to refer to the former Yugoslavia. Between 27 April 1992 and 1 November 2000, Yugoslavia undertook numerous treaty actions with respect to treaties deposited with the Secretary-General. Consistent with the claim of Yugoslavia to continue the international legal personality of the former Yugoslavia, these treaty actions were also listed in status lists against the name "Yugoslavia". Accordingly, the Secretary-General, as depositary, did not make any differentiation in the present publication between treaty actions that were performed by the former Yugoslavia and those that were performed by Yugoslavia, both categories of treaty actions being listed against the name "Yugoslavia". The General Assembly admitted Yugoslavia to membership by its resolution A/RES/55/12 on 1 November 2000. At the same time, Yugoslavia renounced its claim to have continued the international legal personality of the former Yugoslavia.

Treaty actions undertaken by Yugoslavia were subsequently listed in this publication against the designation "Serbia and Montenegro" until 2 June 2006.

Treaty actions undertaken by the former Yugoslavia appear in footnotes, against the designation "former Yugoslavia".

See note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "Slovenia", "Serbia and Montenegro", "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia".

For information on the treatment of treaty actions by predecessor States and successor States in the status tables, see Part C, "Status tables" of the "Introduction" to this publication.

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

Note 1.

The People's Republic of Zanzibar was admitted to membership on 16 December 1963 by Resolution No. 1975 (XVIII). For the text of the Declaration of acceptance of the obligations contained in the Charter dated 10 December 1963 made by Zanzibar (registered under No. 7016), see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 483, p. 237.

In a note addressed to the Secretary General on 6 May 1964, the Ministry of External Affairs of the United Republic of Tanzania informed him that, following the signature and ratification of the Articles of Union between the Republic of Tanganyika and the People's Republic of Zanzibar, the two countries had been united on 26 April 1964, as one sovereign State under the name of the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar. The Ministry further asked the Secretary-General "to note that the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar declares that it is now a single Member of the United Nations bound by the provisions of the Charter, and that all international treaties and agreements in force between the Republic of Tanganyika or the People's Republic of Zanzibar and other States or international organizations will, to the extent that their implementation is consistent with the constitutional position established by the Articles of the Union, remain in force within the regional limits prescribed on their conclusion and in accordance with the principles of international law".

In communicating the above-mentioned note, in accordance with the request contained therein, to all States Members of the United Nations, to the principal organs of the United Nations and to the subsidiary organs of the United Nations to which Tanganyika and Zanzibar had been appointed, and to the specialized agencies of the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Secretary-General stated that he "is taking action, within the limits of his administrative responsibilities, to give effect to the declaration in the attached note the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar is now a single Member of the United Nations bound by the provisions of the Charter. This action is undertaken without prejudice to and pending such action as other organs of the United Nations may take on the basis of the notification of the establishment of the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar." No objection was raised in this regard in any of the organs concerned.

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General on 2 November 1964, the Permanent Mission of the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar informed him that "the United Republic of Tanganika and Zanzibar shall, with immediate effect, be known as the United Republic of Tanzania".

Subsequently, the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania confirmed to the Secretary-General that the United Republic of Tanzania continues to be bound by multilateral treaties in respect of which the Secretary-General acts as depositary and which had been signed, ratified or acceded to on behalf of Tanganyika.

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Note 1.

As from 17 November 2004. Formerly: "Venezuela".

VIET NAM

Note 1.

The Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Republic of South Viet-Nam (the latter of which replaced the Republic of Viet Nam) united on 2 July 1976 to constitute a new State, the Socialist Republic of Viet-Nam (Viet-Nam).

YEMEN

Note 1.

In a letter dated 19 May 1990, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Yemen Arab Republic and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen informed the Secretary-General of the following:

". . . The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and the Yemen Arab Republic will merge in a single sovereign State called the Republic of Yemen' (short form: Yemen) with Sana'a as its capital, as soon as it is proclaimed on Tuesday, 22 May 1990. The Republic of Yemen will have single membership in the United Nations and be bound by the provisions of the Charter. All treaties and agreements concluded between either the Yemen Arab Republic or the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and other States and international organizations in accordance with international law which are in force on 22 May 1990 will remain in effect, and international relations existing on 22 May 1990 between the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and the Yemen Arab Republic and other States will continue."

As concerns the treaties concluded prior to their union by the Yemen Arab Republic or the People's Democratic

Republic of Yemen, the Republic of Yemen (as now united) is accordingly to be considered as a party to those treaties as from the date when one of these States first became a party to those treaties. Accordingly the tables showing the status of treaties will now indicate under the designation "Yemen" the date of the formalities (signatures, ratifications, accessions, declarations and reservations, etc.) effected by the State which first became a party, those eventually effected by the other being described in a footnote.

The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen was admitted to the United Nations by Resolution No. 2310 (XXII) of 14 December 1967 registered under No. 8861. For the text of the declaration of acceptance of the obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations made by the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 614, p. 21. The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen was successively listed in the previous editions as "Southern Yemen", "People's Republic of Southern Yemen", "People's Democratic Republic of Yemen" and "Democratic Republic of Yemen".

YUGOSLAVIA

Note 1.

By a notification dated 8 March 2001, received by the Secretary-General on 12 March 2001, the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia lodged an instrument, *inter alia* , advising its intent to succeed to various multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General, and confirming certain actions relating to such treaties. The notification stated the following:

"[T]he Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, having considered the treaties listed in the attached annex 1, succeeds to the same and undertakes faithfully to perform and carry out the stipulations therein contained as from April 27, 1992, the date upon which the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia assumed responsibility for its international relations [Ed. note: Annex 1 attached to the notification contains a list of treaties to which the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was a signatory or party],

...[T]he Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia maintains the signatures, reservations, declarations and objections made by the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to the treaties listed in the attached annex 1, prior to the date on which the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia assumed responsibility for its international relations.

...[T]he Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia confirms those treaty actions and declarations made by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia which are listed in the attached annex 2. [Ed. note: Annex 2 attached to the notification contains a list of certain treaty actions undertaken by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia between 27 April 1992 and 1 November 2000.]"

Entries in status tables relating to treaty actions undertaken by Yugoslavia between the date of the dissolution of the former Yugoslavia and the date of admission of Yugoslavia to membership in the United Nations, which were not dependent on prior treaty actions by the former Yugoslavia or other conditions, had been maintained against the designation "Yvia".

See also "Serbia and Montenegro" and "former Yugoslavia".

Note 2.

In a communication dated 4 February 2003, the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia informed the Secretary-General that :

"...following the adoption and promulgation of the Constitutional Charter of Serbia and Montenegro by the Assembly of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on 4 February 2003, as previously adopted by the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia on 27 January 2003 and by the Assembly of the Republic of Montenegro on 29 January 2003, the name of the State of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was changed to "Serbia and Montenegro [as of 4 February 2003]". ...

See also "Serbia and Montenegro".

For information on the treatment of treaty actions by predecessor States and successor States in the status tables, see Part C, "Status tables" of the "Introduction" to this publication.

YUGOSLAVIA (FORMER)

Note 1.

The former Yugoslavia was an original Member of the United Nations, the Charter having been signed and ratified on its behalf on 26 June 1945, and 19 October 1945, respectively. The following republics constituting the former Yugoslavia declared their independence on the dates indicated: Slovenia (25 June 1991), The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (17 November 1991), Croatia (8 October 1991), and Bosnia and Herzegovina (6 March 1992). Yugoslavia came into being on 27 April 1992 following the promulgation of the constitution of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on that day. Yugoslavia nevertheless advised the Secretary-General on 27 April 1992 that it claimed to continue the international legal personality of the former Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia accordingly claimed to be a member of those international organizations of which the former Yugoslavia had been a member. It also claimed that all those treaty acts that had been performed by the former Yugoslavia were directly attributable to it, as being the same State (See documents S/23877 and A/46/915). Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia and The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, all of which had applied for and were admitted to membership in the United Nations, in accordance with Article 4 of the Charter (by resolutions 46/237 adopted on 22 May 1992, 46/238 adopted on 22 May 1992, 46/236 adopted on 22 May 1992, and 47/225 adopted on 8 April 1993 respectively), objected to this claim.

In its resolution 47/1 of 22 September 1992, the General Assembly, acting upon the recommendation of the

Security Council in its resolution 777 (1992) of 19 September 1992, considered that Yugoslavia could not continue automatically the membership of the former Yugoslavia in the United Nations, and decided that it should accordingly apply for membership in the Organization. It also decided that Yugoslavia could not participate in the work of the General Assembly. The Legal Counsel took the view, however, that this resolution of the General Assembly neither terminated nor suspended the membership of the former Yugoslavia in the United Nations. At the same time, the Legal Counsel expressed the view that the admission of a new Yugoslavia to membership in the United Nations, in accordance with Article 4 of the Charter of the United Nations, would terminate the situation that had been created by General Assembly resolution 47/1 (See document A/47/485). General Assembly resolution 47/1 did not specifically address the question of the status of either the former Yugoslavia or of Yugoslavia with regard to multilateral treaties that were deposited with the Secretary-General. The Legal Counsel took the view in this regard that the Secretary-General was not in a position, as depositary, either to reject or to disregard the claim of Yugoslavia that it continued the legal personality of the former Yugoslavia, absent any decision to the contrary either by a competent organ of the United Nations directing him in the exercise of his depositary functions, or by a competent treaty organ created by a treaty, or by the contracting States to a treaty directing him in the exercise of his depositary functions with regard to that particular treaty, or by a competent organ representative of the international community of States as a whole on the general issue of continuity and discontinuity of statehood to which the claim of Yugoslavia gave rise.

Consistent with the claim of Yugoslavia to continue the international legal personality of the former Yugoslavia, the Secretary-General, as depositary, continued to list treaty actions that had been performed by the former Yugoslavia in status lists in the present publication, using for that purpose the short-form name "Yugoslavia", which was used at that time to refer to the former Yugoslavia. Between 27 April 1992 and 1 November 2000, Yugoslavia undertook numerous treaty actions with respect to treaties deposited with the Secretary-General. Consistent with the claim of Yugoslavia to continue the international legal personality of the former Yugoslavia, these treaty actions were also listed in status lists against the name "Yugoslavia". Accordingly, the Secretary-General, as depositary, did not make any differentiation in the present publication between treaty actions that were performed by the former Yugoslavia and those that were performed by Yugoslavia, both categories of treaty actions being listed against the name "Yugoslavia". The General Assembly admitted Yugoslavia to membership by its resolution A/RES/55/12 on 1 November 2000. At the same time, Yugoslavia renounced its claim to have continued the international legal personality of the former Yugoslavia.

Treaty actions undertaken by Yugoslavia were subsequently listed in this publication against the designation "Serbia and Montenegro" until 2 June 2006.

Treaty actions undertaken by the former Yugoslavia appear in footnotes, against the designation "former Yugoslavia".

See note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "Slovenia", "Serbia and Montenegro", "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia".

For information on the treatment of treaty actions by predecessor States and successor States in the status tables, see Part C, "Status tables" of the "Introduction" to this publication.

Volume I

GENERAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I United Nations Multilateral Treaties 1
CHAPTER I Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice 3
CHAPTER II Pacific Settlement of International Disputes 41
CHAPTER III Privileges and Immunities, Diplomatic and Consular Relations, Etc 43
CHAPTER IV Human Rights 145
CHAPTER V Refugees and Stateless Persons 469
CHAPTER VI Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances 509
CHAPTER VII Traffic In Persons 593
INDEX 622

Volume II

GENERAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I United Nations Multilateral Treaties 1
CHAPTER VIII Obscene Publications 3
CHAPTER IX Health 17
CHAPTER X International Trade and Development 49
CHAPTER XI Transport and Communications 115
INDEX 553

Volume III

GENERAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I United Nations Multilateral Treaties 1
CHAPTER XII Navigation 3
CHAPTER XIII Economic Statistics 49
CHAPTER XIV Educational and Cultural Matters 55
CHAPTER XV Declaration of Death of Missing Persons 89
CHAPTER XVI Status of Women 93
CHAPTER XVII Freedom of Information 111
CHAPTER XVIII Penal Matters 113
CHAPTER XIX Commodities 305
CHAPTER XX Maintenance Obligations 403
CHAPTER XXI Law of the Sea 417
CHAPTER XXII Commercial Arbitration 511
CHAPTER XXIII Law of Treaties 525
CHAPTER XXIV Outer Space 547
CHAPTER XXV Telecommunications 551
CHAPTER XXVI Disarmament 565
CHAPTER XXVII Environment 615
CHAPTER XXVIII Fiscal Matters 745
CHAPTER XXIX Miscellaneous 749
PART II 751
INDEX 845

Volume I

Part I
United Nations Multilateral Treaties

Chapters I to VII

CHAPTER I. CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND STATUTE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

1. Charter of the United Nations. San Francisco, 26 June 1945 3
2. Declarations of Acceptance of the Obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations - Admission of States to Membership in the United Nations in accordance with Article 4 of the Charter. 5
3. Statute of the International Court of Justice. 10
4. Declarations recognizing as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court. 11

5. a) Amendments to Articles 23, 27 and 61 of the Charter of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolutions 1991 A and B (XVIII) of 17 December 1963. New York, 17 December 1963 35

5. b) Amendment to Article 109 of the Charter of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 2101 (XX) of 20 December 1965. New York, 20 December 1965 37

5. c) Amendment to Article 61 of the Charter of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 2847 (XXVI) of 20 December 1971. New York, 20 December 1971 39

CHAPTER II. PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

1. Revised General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes. New York, 28 April 1949 41

CHAPTER III. PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES, DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR RELATIONS, ETC

1. Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations. New York, 13 February 1946 43
2. Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. New York, 21 November 1947 49

2. 1) Annex I - International Labour Organisation (ILO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. San Francisco, 10 July 1948 56

2. 2) Annex II - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Washington, 29 November 1948 58

2. 2a) Revised text of Annex II - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Rome, 20 November 1959 60

2. 2b) Second revised text of Annex II - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Rome, 8 December 1965 61

2. 3) Annex III - International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Geneva, 21 June 1948 63

2. 4) Annex IV - United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Paris, 7 February 1949 65

2. 5) Annex V - International Monetary Fund (IMF) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Washington, 11 April 1949 68

2. 6) Annex VI - International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Washington, 19 April 1949 70

2. 7) Annex VII - World Health Organization (WHO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Geneva, 17 July 1948 72

2. 7a) Revised text of Annex VII - World Health Organization (WHO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Geneva, 26 May 1950 74

2. 7b) Second revised text of Annex VII - World Health Organization (WHO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Geneva, 27 May 1957 75

2. 7c) Third revised text of Annex VII - World Health Organization (WHO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Minneapolis, 17 July 1958 76

2. 8) Annex VIII - Universal Postal Union (UPU) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Geneva, 25 May 1949 78

2. 9) Annex IX - International Telecommunication Union (ITU) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Geneva, 6 October 1950 ... 80
2. 10) Annex X - International Refugee Organization (IRO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies*. Geneva, 29 March 1949 ... 82
2. 11) Annex XI - World Meteorological Organization (WMO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Paris, 17 April 1951 ... 83
2. 12) Annex XII - International Maritime Organization (IMO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. London, 16 January 1959 ... 85
2. 12a) Revised text of Annex XII - International Maritime Organization (IMO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. London, 16 May 1968 ... 87
2. 12b) Second Revised text of Annex XII - International Maritime Organization (IMO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. London, 22 November 2001 ... 88
2. 13) Annex XIII - International Finance Corporation (IFC) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Washington, 2 April 1959 ... 89
2. 14) Annex XIV - International Development Association (IDA) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Washington, 13 February 1962 ... 91
2. 15) Annex XV - World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Geneva, 4 October 1977 ... 93
2. 16) Annex XVI - International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Rome, 16 December 1977 ... 95
2. 17) Annex XVII - United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Vienna, 3 July 1987 ... 96
2. 18) Annex XVIII - World Tourism Organization (WTO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Jeju, 30 July 2008 ... 97
3. Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. Vienna, 18 April 1961 ... 98
4. Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, concerning Acquisition of Nationality. Vienna, 18 April 1961 ... 117
5. Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes. Vienna, 18 April 1961 ... 119
6. Vienna Convention on Consular Relations. Vienna, 24 April 1963 ... 122
7. Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations concerning Acquisition of Nationality. Vienna, 24 April 1963 ... 132
8. Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes. Vienna, 24 April 1963 ... 134
9. Convention on special missions. New York, 8 December 1969 ... 136
10. Optional Protocol to the Convention on Special Missions concerning the compulsory settlement of disputes. New York, 8 December 1969 ... 138
11. Vienna Convention on the Representation of States in their Relations with International Organizations of a Universal Character. Vienna, 14 March 1975 ... 139
12. Vienna Convention on Succession of States in Respect of State Property, Archives and Debts. Vienna, 8 April 1983 ... 141
13. United Nations Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and Their Property. New York, 2 December 2004 ... 142

CHAPTER IV. HUMAN RIGHTS

1. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. New York, 9 December 1948 ... 145
2. International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. New York, 7 March 1966 ... 157
2. a) Amendment to article 8 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. New York, 15 January 1992 ... 181
3. International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. New York, 16 December 1966 ... 182
3. a) Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. New York, 10 December 2008 ... 203
4. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. New York, 16 December 1966 ... 204
5. Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. New York, 16 December 1966 ... 267
6. Convention on the non-applicability of statutory limitations to war crimes and crimes against humanity. New York, 26 November 1968 ... 277

7. International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid. New York, 30 November 1973 280
8. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. New York, 18 December 1979 284
8. a) Amendment to article 20, paragraph 1 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. New York, 22 December 1995 353
8. b) Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. New York, 6 October 1999 355
9. Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. New York, 10 December 1984 358
9. a) Amendments to articles 17 (7) and 18 (5) of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. New York, 8 September 1992 383
9. b) Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. New York, 18 December 2002 384
10. International Convention against Apartheid in Sports. New York, 10 December 1985 387
11. Convention on the Rights of the Child. New York, 20 November 1989 389
11. a) Amendment to article 43 (2) of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. New York, 12 December 1995 416
11. b) Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict. New York, 25 May 2000 419
11. c) Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography. New York, 25 May 2000 442
12. Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty. New York, 15 December 1989 451
13. International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families. New York, 18 December 1990 454
14. Agreement establishing the Fund for the Development of the Indigenous Peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean. Madrid, 24 July 1992 458
15. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. New York, 13 December 2006 459
15. a) Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. New York, 13 December 2006 464
16. International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. New York, 20 December 2006 466

CHAPTER V. REFUGEES AND STATELESS PERSONS

1. Constitution of the International Refugee Organization*. New York, 15 December 1946 469
2. Convention relating to the Status of Refugees. Geneva, 28 July 1951 470
3. Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons. New York, 28 September 1954 490
4. Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness. New York, 30 August 1961 499
5. Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees. New York, 31 January 1967 503

CHAPTER VI. NARCOTIC DRUGS AND PSYCHOTROPIC SUBSTANCES

1. Protocol amending the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on Narcotic Drugs, concluded at The Hague on 23 January 1912, at Geneva on 11 February 1925 and 19 February 1925, and 13 July 1931, at Bangkok on 27 November 1931 and at Geneva on 26 June 1936. Lake Success, New York, 11 December 1946 509
2. International Opium Convention. The Hague, 23 January 1912 512
3. Agreement concerning the Suppression of the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in, and Use of, Prepared Opium. Geneva, 11 February 1925 and Lake Success, New York, 11 December 1946 517
4. Agreement concerning the Suppression of the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in, and Use of, Prepared Opium. Geneva, 11 February 1925 518
5. International Opium Convention. Geneva, 19 February 1925 and Lake Success, New York, 11 December 1946 519
6. a) International Opium Convention. Geneva, 19 February 1925 521
6. b) Protocol to the International Opium Convention. Geneva, 19 February 1925 524
7. Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs. Geneva, 13 July 1931 and Lake Success, New York, 11 December 1946 526

8. a) Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs. Geneva, 13 July 1931 529
8. b) Protocol of Signature. Geneva, 13 July 1931 533
9. Agreement concerning the Suppression of Opium Smoking. Bangkok, 27 November 1931 and Lake Success, New York, 11 December 1946 536
10. Agreement concerning the Suppression of Opium Smoking. Bangkok, 27 November 1931 537
11. Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs. Geneva, 26 June 1936 and Lake Success, New York, 11 December 1946 538
12. a) Convention of 1936 for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs. Geneva, 26 June 1936 540
12. b) Protocol of Signature. Geneva, 26 June 1936 542
13. Protocol Bringing under International Control Drugs Outside the Scope of the Convention of 13 July 1931 for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, as amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946. Paris, 19 November 1948 544
14. Protocol for Limiting and Regulating the Cultivation of the Poppy Plant, the Production of, International and Wholesale Trade in, and use of Opium. New York, 23 June 1953 548
15. Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961. New York, 30 March 1961 551
16. Convention on psychotropic substances. Vienna, 21 February 1971 559
17. Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961. Geneva, 25 March 1972 569
18. Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961. New York, 8 August 1975 574
19. United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances. Vienna, 20 December 1988 579

CHAPTER VII. TRAFFIC IN PERSONS

1. Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 12 November 1947, to amend the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, concluded at Geneva on 30 September 1921, and the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age, concluded at Geneva on 11 October 1933. Lake Success, New York, 12 November 1947 593
2. International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, concluded at Geneva on 30 September 1921, as amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 12 November 1947. Lake Success, 12 November 1947 595
3. International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children. Geneva, 30 September 1921 597
4. International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age, concluded at Geneva on 11 October 1933, as amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 12 November 1947. Lake Success, 12 November 1947 600
5. International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age. Geneva, 11 October 1933 602
6. Protocol amending the International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 18 May 1904, and the International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910. Lake Success, New York, 4 May 1949 604
7. International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 18 May 1904, amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, 4 May 1949. Lake Success, New York, 4 May 1949 606
8. International Agreement for the suppression of the "White Slave Traffic". Paris, 18 May 1904 608
9. International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910, amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, 4 May 1949. Lake Success, New York, 4 May 1949 611
10. International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic. Paris, 4 May 1910 613
11. a) Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others. Lake Success, New York, 21 March 1950 615
11. b) Final Protocol to the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others. Lake Success, New York, 21 March 1950 619

Part I

UNITED NATIONS MULTILATERAL TREATIES

Chapters I to VII

CHAPTER I

CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND STATUTE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

1. CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

San Francisco, 26 June 1945

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 October 1945, in accordance with article 110.[1,2,3,4,5,6]
STATUS: Parties: 49.

Note: 192 Members [49[1,6] original Members and 142 Members having been admitted in accordance with Article 4 (see list under chapter I.2. hereinafter.)].

Participant	*Ratification*
Argentina	24 Sep 1945
Australia	1 Nov 1945
Belarus[3]	24 Oct 1945
Belgium	27 Dec 1945
Bolivia	14 Nov 1945
Brazil	21 Sep 1945
Canada	9 Nov 1945
Chile	11 Oct 1945
China[4,7,8]	28 Sep 1945
Colombia	5 Nov 1945
Costa Rica	2 Nov 1945
Cuba	15 Oct 1945
Denmark	9 Oct 1945
Dominican Republic	4 Sep 1945
Ecuador	21 Dec 1945
Egypt[5]	22 Oct 1945
El Salvador	26 Sep 1945
Ethiopia	13 Nov 1945
France	31 Aug 1945
Greece[9]	25 Oct 1945
Guatemala	21 Nov 1945
Haiti	27 Sep 1945
Honduras	17 Dec 1945
India	30 Oct 1945
Iran (Islamic Republic of)[10]	16 Oct 1945
Iraq	21 Dec 1945
Lebanon	15 Oct 1945
Liberia	2 Nov 1945
Luxembourg	17 Oct 1945
Mexico	7 Nov 1945
Netherlands[11]	10 Dec 1945
New Zealand[12]	19 Sep 1945
Nicaragua	6 Sep 1945
Norway	27 Nov 1945
Panama	13 Nov 1945
Paraguay	12 Oct 1945
Peru	31 Oct 1945
Philippines	11 Oct 1945
Poland	24 Oct 1945
Russian Federation[13]	24 Oct 1945
Saudi Arabia	18 Oct 1945
South Africa[14]	7 Nov 1945
Syrian Arab Republic[5]	19 Oct 1945
Turkey	28 Sep 1945
Ukraine[15]	24 Oct 1945
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[7]	20 Oct 1945
United States of America	8 Aug 1945
Uruguay	18 Dec 1945
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)[16]	15 Nov 1945

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia was an original Member of the United Nations, the Charter having been signed and ratified on its behalf on 26 June 1945 and 19 October 1945, respectively, until its dissolution. Treaty actions undertaken by the former Yugoslavia appear in footnotes against the designation "former Yugoslavia". See note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Serbia and Montenegro", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] All States listed herein signed the Charter on 26 June 1945, with the exception of Poland on behalf of which it was signed on 15 October 1945.

[3] See note 1 under "Belarus" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "United Arab Republic" ("Egypt" and "Syria") in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] Czechoslovakia was an original Member of the United Nations, the Charter having been signed and ratified on its behalf on 26 June 1945 and 19 October 1945, respectively, until its dissolution on 31 December 1992. See also note 1 under Czech Republic and note 1 under Slovakia in the Historical Information section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 2 under China and note 2 under United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland regarding Hong Kong in the Historical Information section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 3 under China and note 1 under Portugal regarding Macao in the Historical Information section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] See note 1 under "Greece" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] See note 1 under Iran, Islamic Republic of in the Historical Information section in the front matter of this volume.

[11] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[12] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[13] See note 1 under Russian Federation in the Historical Information section in the front matter of this volume.

[14] See note 1 under South Africa in the Historical Information section in the front matter of this volume.

[15] See note 1 under Ukraine in the Historical Information section in the front matter of this volume.

[16] See note 1 under Venezuela in the Historical Information section in the front matter of this volume.

2. DECLARATIONS OF ACCEPTANCE OF THE OBLIGATIONS CONTAINED IN THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS - ADMISSION OF STATES TO MEMBERSHIP IN THE UNITED NATIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 4 OF THE CHARTER[1]

STATUS: 142 Members. See also "Status" in chapter I.1.

Decision of the General Assembly			*Registration and Publication of the Declarations*[2]			
Participant	*Resolution*	*Date of Adoption*	*Registration Date*	*Registration Number*	*UNTS Volume*	*UNTS Page*
Afghanistan[1]	34 (I)	9 Nov 1946	14 Dec 1946	7	1	39
Albania	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3043	223	23
Algeria	1745 (XVII)	8 Oct 1962	11 Oct 1962	6336	442	37
Andorra	47/232	28 Jul 1993	28 Jul 1993	30158	1728	31
Angola[3]	31/44	1 Dec 1976	1 Sep 1978	16920	1102	205
Antigua and Barbuda	36/26	11 Nov 1981	11 Nov 1981	20564	1256	47
Armenia	46/227	2 Mar 1992	2 Mar 1992	28686	1668	201
Austria	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3044	223	27
Azerbaijan	46/230	2 Mar 1992	2 Mar 1992	28691	1668	221
Bahamas	3051 (XXVII)	18 Sep 1973	18 Sep 1973	12760	891	109
Bahrain	2752 (XXVI)	21 Sep 1971	21 Sep 1971	11351	797	77
Bangladesh	3203 (XXIX)	17 Sep 1974	17 Sep 1974	13543	950	3
Barbados	21 75 (XXI)	9 Dec 1966	9 Dec 1966	8437	581	131
Belize	36/3	25 Sep 1981	25 Sep 1981	20408	1252	59
Benin[4]	1481 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	20 Sep 1960	5357	375	91
Bhutan	2751 (XXVI)	21 Sep 1971	21 Sep 1971	11340	796	295
Bosnia and Herzegovina[5]	46/237	22 May 1992	22 May 1992	28937	1675	227
Botswana	2136 (XXI)	17 Oct 1966	17 Oct 1966	8357	575	151
Brunei Darussalam	39/1	21 Sep 1984	21 Sep 1984	23093	1369	81
Bulgaria	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3045	223	31
Burkina Faso[6]	1483 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	20 Sep 1960	5359	375	99
Burundi	1749 (XVII)	18 Sep 1962	18 Sep 1962	6303	437	149
Cambodia[7]	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3046	223	35
Cameroon[8]	1467 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	20 Sep 1960	5354	375	79
Cape Verde	3363 (XXX)	16 Sep 1975	16 Sep 1975	14309	981	345
Central African Republic[9]	1488 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	20 Sep 1960	5363	375	115
Chad	1485 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	20 Sep 1960	5361	375	107
Comoros	3385 (XXX)	12 Nov 1975	12 Nov 1975	14414	986	239
Congo[10]	1486 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	20 Sep 1960	5362	375	111
Côte d'Ivoire[11]	1484 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	20 Sep 1960	5360	375	103
Croatia[5]	46/238	22 May 1992	22 May 1992	28935	1675	219
Cyprus	1489 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	9 Jun 1961	5711	397	283
Czech Republic[12]	47/221	19 Jan 1993	19 Jan 1993	29466	1703	199
Democratic People's Republic of	46/1	17 Sep 1991	17 Sep 1991	28363	1649	297

Participant	*Resolution*	*Date of Adoption*	*Registration Date*	*Registration Number*	*UNTS Volume*	*UNTS Page*
Korea						
Democratic Republic of the Congo[13]	1480 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	2 Jan 1960	6022	418	157
Djibouti	32/1	20 Sep 1977	1 Sep 1978	16922	1102	213
Dominica	33/107	18 Dec 1978	18 Dec 1978	17409	1120	111
Equatorial Guinea	2384 (XXIII)	12 Nov 1968	12 Nov 1968	9295	649	197
Eritrea	47/230	28 May 1993	28 May 1993	30068	1723	215
Estonia[14]	46/4	17 Sep 1991	17 Sep 1991	28368	1649	317
Fiji	2622 (XXV)	13 Oct 1970	13 Oct 1970	10789	752	207
Finland	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	19 Dec 1955	3055	223	69
Gabon	1487 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	7 Nov 1960	5436	379	99
Gambia	2008 (XX)	21 Sep 1965	21 Sep 1965	7928	545	143
Georgia	46/241	31 Jul 1992	31 Jul 1992	29076	1684	37
Germany[15]	3050 (XXVIII)	18 Sep 1973	18 Sep 1973	12759	891	105
Ghana	1118 (XI)	8 Mar 1957	8 Mar 1957	3727	261	113
Grenada	3204 (XXIX)	17 Sep 1974	7 Sep 1974	13544	950	7
Guinea	1325 (XIII)	12 Dec 1958	12 Dec 1958	4595	317	77
Guinea-Bissau	3205 (XXIX)	17 Sep 1974	17 Sep 1974	13545	950	11
Guyana	2133 (XXI)	20 Sep 1966	20 Sep 1966	8316	572	225
Hungary	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	15 Dec 1955	3054	223	65
Iceland[1]	34 (I)	9 Nov 1946	14 Dec 1946	8	1	41
Indonesia[16]	491 (V)	28 Sep 1950	28 Sep 1950	916	71	153
Ireland	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	29 Nov 1956	3594	254	223
Israel	273 (III)	11 May 1949	11 May 1949	448	30	53
Italy	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	9 Apr 1956	3217	231	175
Jamaica	1750 (XVII)	18 Sep 1962	18 Sep 1962	6304	437	153
Japan	1113 (XI)	18 Dec 1956	18 Dec 1956	3626	256	167
Jordan	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3048	223	43
Kazakhstan	46/224	2 Mar 1992	2 Mar 1992	28687	1668	205
Kenya	1976 (XVIII)	16 Dec 1963	16 Dec 1963	7015	483	233
Kiribati	54/1	14 Sep 1999	14 Sep 1999	36932	2121	115
Kuwait	1872 (S-IV)	14 May 1963	14 May 1963	6705	463	213
Kyrgyzstan	46/225	2 Mar 1992	2 Mar 1992	28688	1668	209
Lao People's Democratic Republic[17]	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3049	223	47
Latvia[18]	46/5	17 Sep 1991	17 Sep 1991	28369	1649	321
Lesotho	2137 (XXI)	17 Oct 1966	17 Oct 1966	8358	575	155
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya[19]	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3050	223	51
Liechtenstein	45/1	18 Sep 1990	18 Sep 1990	27554	1578	319
Lithuania[20]	46/6	17 Sep 1991	17 Sep 1991	28367	1649	313
Madagascar	1478 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	20 Sep 1960	5356	375	87
Malawi[21]		1 Dec 1964	1 Dec 1964	7496	519	3
Malaysia[22]	1134 (XII)	17 Sep 1957	17 Sep 1957	3995	277	3
Maldives[23]	2009 (XX)	21 Sep 1965	21 Sep 1965	7929	545	147
Mali	1491 (XV)	28 Sep 1960	28 Oct 1960	5412	377	361

Participant	*Resolution*	*Date of Adoption*	*Registration Date*	*Registration Number*	*UNTS Volume*	*UNTS Page*
Malta[21]		1 Dec 1964	1 Dec 1964	7497	519	7
Marshall Islands	46/3	17 Sep 1991	17 Sep 1991	28366	1649	309
Mauritania	1631 (XVI)	27 Oct 1961	26 Mar 1963	6576	457	59
Mauritius	2371 (XXII)	24 Apr 1968	24 Apr 1968	9064	634	217
Micronesia (Federated States of)[24]	46/2	17 Sep 1991	17 Sep 1991	28364	1649	301
Moldova	46/223	2 Mar 1992	2 Mar 1992	28692	1668	225
Monaco	47/231	28 May 1993	28 May 1993	30067	1723	11
Mongolia	1630 (XVI)	27 Oct 1961	17 Jul 1962	6261	434	141
Montenegro[25]	60/264	28 Jun 2006	19 July 2006	42946		
Morocco	1111 (XI)	12 Nov 1956	12 Nov 1956	3575	253	77
Mozambique	3365 (XXX)	16 Sep 1975	16 Sep 1975	14310	981	349
Myanmar[26]	188 (S-II)	19 Apr 1948	19 Apr 1948	225	15	3
Namibia[27]	S-18/1	23 Apr 1990	23 Apr 1990	27200	1564	69
Nauru	54/2	14 Sep 1999	14 Sep 1999	36937	2121	177
Nepal	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3051	223	55
Niger	1482 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	20 Sep 1960	5358	375	95
Nigeria	1492 (XV)	7 Oct 1960	8 May 1961	5688	395	237
Oman	2754 (XXVI)	7 Oct 1971	7 Oct 1971	11359	797	225
Pakistan[1]	108 (II)	30 Sep 1947	30 Sep 1947	112	8	57
Palau[28]	49/163	15 Dec 1994	15 Dec 1994	31428	1843	181
Papua New Guinea	3368 (XXX)	10 Oct 1975	10 Oct 1975	14377	985	51
Portugal[29]	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	21 Feb 1956	3155	229	3
Qatar	2753 (XXVI)	21 Sep 1971	21 Sep 1971	11352	797	81
Republic of Korea	46/1	17 Sep 1991	17 Sep 1991	28365	1649	305
Romania	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3052	223	59
Rwanda	1748 (XVII)	18 Sep 1962	18 Sep 1962	6302	437	145
Samoa	31/104	15 Dec 1976	15 Dec 1976	15164	1031	3
San Marino	46/231	2 Mar 1992	2 Mar 1992	28694	1668	231
Sao Tome and Principe	3364 (XXX)	16 Sep 1975	16 Sep 1975	14311	981	353
Senegal	1490 (XV)	28 Sep 1960	28 Sep 1960	5374	376	79
Serbia[5]	55/12	1 Nov 2000	1 Nov 2000	36991	2124	3
Seychelles	31/1	21 Sep 1976	21 Sep 1976	15022	1023	107
Sierra Leone	1623 (XVI)	27 Sep 1961	27 Sep 1961	5876	409	43
Singapore	2010 (XX)	21 Sep 1965	21 Sep 1965	7930	545	151
Slovakia[12]	47/222	19 Jan 1993	19 Jan 1993	29465	1703	195
Slovenia[5]	46/236	22 May 1992	22 May 1992	28936	1675	223
Solomon Islands	33/1	19 Sep 1978	19 Sep 1978	17087	1106	137
Somalia	1479 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	23 Feb 1961	5577	388	179
Spain	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3053	223	63
Sri Lanka[30]	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3047	223	39
St. Kitts and Nevis[31]	38/1	23 Sep 1983	23 Sep 1983	22359	1332	261
St. Lucia	34/1	18 Sep 1979	18 Sep 1979	17969	1145	201
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	35/1	16 Sep 1980	16 Sep 1980	19076	1198	185
Sudan	1110 (XI)	12 Nov 1956	12 Nov 1956	3576	253	81
Suriname[32]	3413 (XXX)	4 Dec 1975	1 Jun 1976	14784	1007	343

Participant	*Resolution*	*Date of Adoption*	*Registration Date*	*Registration Number*	*UNTS Volume*	*UNTS Page*
Swaziland	2376 (XXIII)	24 Sep 1968	24 Sep 1968	9252	646	177
Sweden[1]	34 (I)	9 Nov 1946	14 Dec 1946	9	1	43
Switzerland	57 (I)	10 Sep 2002	10 Sep 2002	38864	2195	291
Tajikistan	46/228	2 Mar 1992	2 Mar 1992	28690	1668	217
Thailand[1]	101 (I)	15 Dec 1946	16 Dec 1946	11	1	47
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[5]	47/225	8 Apr 1993	8 Apr 1993	29892	1719	31
Timor-Leste	57/3	27 Sep 2002	27 Sep 2002	38866	2195	309
Togo	1477 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	20 Sep 1960	5355	375	83
Tonga	54/3	14 Sep 1999	14 Sep 1999	36938	2121	181
Trinidad and Tobago	1751 (XVII)	18 Sep 1962	18 Sep 1962	6305	437	157
Tunisia	1112 (XI)	12 Nov 1956	12 Nov 1956	3577	253	85
Turkmenistan	46/229	2 Mar 1992	2 Mar 1992	28693	1668	227
Tuvalu	55/1	5 Sep 2000	5 Sept 2000	36939	2121	185
Uganda	1758 (XVII)	25 Oct 1962	25 Oct 1962	6357	443	47
United Arab Emirates	2794 (XXVI)	9 Dec 1971	9 Dec 1971	11424	802	101
United Republic of Tanzania[33]	1667 (XVI)	14 Dec 1961	14 Dec 1961	6000	416	147
Uzbekistan	46/226	2 Mar 1992	2 Mar 1992	28689	1668	213
Vanuatu	36/1	15 Sep 1981	15 Sep 1981	20385	1249	167
Viet Nam[34]	32/2	20 Sep 1977	1 Sep 1978	16921	1102	209
Yemen[1,35]	108 (II)	30 Sep 1947	30 Sep 1947	113	8	59
Zambia[21]		1 Dec 1964	1 Dec 1964	7498	519	11
Zimbabwe	11/1 (S-XI)	25 Aug 1980	25 Aug 1980	19058	1197	323

Notes:

[1] The Provisional Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly (rules 113-116), under which the first six new Members were admitted to membership in the United Nations, namely, Afghanistan, Iceland, Pakistan, Sweden, Thailand and Yemen, stipulated that the membership, in case of a favourable decision of the General Assembly, shall become effective on the date on which the applicant State presented to the Secretary-General an instrument of adherence. Accordingly, the membership of Afghanistan, Iceland and Sweden became effective on 19 November 1946, that of Thailand on 16 December 1946 and that of Pakistan and Yemen on 30 September 1947.

By resolution 116 (II) of 21 November 1947, the General Assembly adopted new rules governing the admission of new Members. Under these rules (135-139), a declaration, made in a formal instrument accepting the obligations contained in the Charter, shall be submitted to the Secretary-General by an applicant State at the same time as the application for membership. The membership becomes effective, if the application is approved, on the date on which the General Assembly takes its decision on the application. Accordingly, for all Members other than the six mentioned in the preceding paragraph, the membership became effective on the respective dates of adoption as indicated in the third column of the table.

[2] The declarations are registered *ex officio* with the Secretariat on the effective dates of membership. However, since the registration did not start until 14 December 1946, when the General Assembly, by resolution 97 (I), adopted the regulations to give effect to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations, the declarations of Afghanistan, Iceland and Sweden were registered on that date. Furthermore, in some instances, where the declaration accepting the obligations contained in the Charter was submitted to the Secretary-General together with the application in cabled form or emanated from a representative other than the Head of State or Government or the Minister for Foreign Affairs, the registration was not effected until the date of receipt by the Secretary-General of the confirmation of the declaration in the formal instrument bearing the signature of one of those authorities. (For the text of the Regulations to give effect to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations, adopted by General Assembly resolution 97 (I) of 14 December 1946 and modified by resolutions 364 B(IV), 482 (V) and 33/141 A of 1 December 1949, 12 December 1950 and 18 December 1978, respectively, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 859, p. VIII.)

[3] The non registration of the declaration by Angola on 1 December 1976, the date of its membership, results from an administrative oversight.

[4] See note 1 under "Benin" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See under "Yugoslavia (former)" in chapter I.1 and notes 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Serbia and Montenegro", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historial Information" section, in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Burkina Faso" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "Cambodia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "Cameroon" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] See note 1 under "Central African Republic" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] See note 1 under "Congo" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[11] See note 1 under "Côte d'Ivoire" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[12] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[13] See note 1 under "Democratic Republic of the Congo" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[14] See note 1 under "Estonia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[15] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[16] See note 1 under "Indonesia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[17] See note 1 under "Lao People's Democratic Republic" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[18] See note 1 under "Latvia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[19] See note 1 under "Libyan Arab Jamahiriya" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[20] See note 1 under "Lithuania" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[21] The decision to admit Malawi, Malta and Zambia to membership in the United Nations was taken by the General Assembly during its nineteenth session at the 1286th meeting held on l December 1964.

[22] See note 1 under "Malaysia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[23] See note 1 under "Maldives" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[24] See note 1 under "Micronesia (Federated States of)" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[25] See note 1 under "Montenegro" and "Serbia and Montenegro" in the "Historocal Information" section, in the front matter of this volume.

[26] See note 1 under "Myanmar" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[27] See note 1 under "Namibia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[28] See note 1 under "Palau" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[29] See note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portugal" regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[30] See note 1 under "Sri Lanka" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[31] See note 1 under "Saint Kitts and Nevis" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[32] See note 1 under "Suriname" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[33] See note 1 under "United Republic of Tanzania" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[34] See note 1 under "Viet Nam" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[35] See note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

3. STATUTE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE[1]

PARTIES: All members of the United Nations. Special cases are noted below:[2]

Participant	
Nauru[3]	as from 29 January 1988
Switzerland[4]	as from 28 July 1948

Notes:

[1] [For the declarations recognizing as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, see chapter I.4.]

[2] See chapters I.1 and I.2. Before becoming Members of the United Nations, Japan, Liechtenstein and San Marino were parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice from 2 April 1954 to 18 December 1956, from 29 March 1950 to 18 September 1990 and from 18 February 1954 to 2 March 1992, respectively; for the text of the declaration by the Government of Japan accepting the conditions determined to that effect, upon the recommendation of the Security Council, by the General Assembly in resolution 805 (VIII) of 9 December 1953 (registered under No. 2524), see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 188, p. 137; for that made by Liechtenstein accepting the conditions determined, upon recommendation of the Security Council, by the General Assembly in resolution 363 (IV) adopted on 1 December 1949 (registered under No. 758), see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 51, p. 115, and for that made by San Marino accepting the conditions determined, upon recommendation of the Security Council, by the General Assembly in resolution 806 (VIII) of 9 December 1953 (registered under No. 2495), see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 186, p. 295.

[3] Upon the recommendation of the Security Council, adopted on 19 October 1987, the General Assembly by resolution 42/21 adopted on 18 November 1987, and in pursuance of Article 93, paragraph 2, of the Charter, determined the conditions upon which Nauru could become a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice. On 29 January 1988, a declaration accepting these conditions was deposited with the Secretary-General on behalf of Nauru (registered under No. 25639, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1491, p. 199) and accordingly on that date Nauru became a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

[4] Upon the recommendation of the Security Council, adopted on 15 November 1946, the General Assembly by resolution 91 (I) adopted on 11 December 1946, and in pursuance of Article 93, paragraph 2, of the Charter, determined the conditions upon which Switzerland could become a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice. On 28 July 1948, a declaration accepting these conditions was deposited with the Secretary-General on behalf of Switzerland (registered under No. 271, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 17, p. 111) and accordingly on that date Switzerland became a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

4. DECLARATIONS RECOGNIZING AS COMPULSORY THE JURISDICTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE UNDER ARTICLE 36, PARAGRAPH 2, OF THE STATUTE OF THE COURT

STATUS: States parties having accepted the jurisdiction of the Court: 66.[1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9]

Note: *Declarations under Article 35, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court as implemented by Security Council Resolution 9 (1946) of 15 October 1946 are deposited with the Registrar of the Court. For those declarations, see United Nations, Treaty Series, or the Yearbooks of the Court.*

States which have made declarations under Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice or whose declarations made under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice are deemed to be acceptances of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. (See paragraph 5 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice.)

(State names which appear in backets are States having made declarations recognizing as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice for specified periods of time and which have been terminated or have since expired. For an explanation thereof, see endnotes at the end of this chapter.)[10]

Participant

Australia
Austria
Barbados
Belgium
[Bolivia[8]]
Botswana
[Brazil[8]]
Bulgaria
Cambodia
Cameroon
Canada
[Colombia[5,11]]
Costa Rica
Côte d'Ivoire
Cyprus
Democratic Republic of the Congo[12]
Denmark
Djibouti
Dominica
Dominican Republic[11]
Egypt
[El Salvador[8]]
Estonia
Finland
[France[4]]
Gambia

Participant

Georgia
Germany
Greece
[Guatemala[8]]
Guinea
Guinea-Bissau
Haiti[11]
Honduras
Hungary
India
[Israel[3]]
Japan
Kenya
Lesotho
Liberia
Liechtenstein
Luxembourg[11]
Madagascar
Malawi
Malta
Mauritius
Mexico
[Nauru[8]]
Netherlands
New Zealand
Nicaragua[11]
Nigeria
Norway
Pakistan
Panama[11]
Paraguay
Peru
Philippines
Poland
Portugal[13]
Senegal
[Serbia[2,6]]
Slovakia
Somalia
[South Africa[7]]
Spain
Sudan
Suriname
Swaziland
Sweden
Switzerland

Participant

[Thailand[8]]
Togo
[Turkey[8]]
Uganda
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
[United States of America[9]]
Uruguay[11]

Texts of the declarations

(The date shown after the name of the State indicates the date of deposit of the declaration.)

a) Declarations made under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice

AUSTRALIA[14]

22 March 2002

"The Government of Australia declares that it recognises as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, until such time as notice may be given to the Secretary-General of the United Nations withdrawing this declaration. This declaration is effective immediately.

This declaration does not apply to:

(a) any dispute in regard to which the parties thereto have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(b) any dispute concerning or relating to the delimitation of maritime zones, including the territorial sea, the exclusive economic zone and the continental shelf, or arising out of, concerning, or relating to the exploitation of any disputed area of or adjacent to any such maritime zone pending its delimitation;

(c) any dispute in respect of which any other party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court only in relation to or for the purpose of the dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other party to the dispute was deposited less than 12 months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court.

DONE at Canberra this 21st day of March two thousand and two.

(Signed) Alexander John Gosse Downer,
Minister for Foreign Affairs of Australia

AUSTRIA[15]

19 May 1971

I hereby declare that the Republic of Austria recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State which accepts or has accepted the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes referred to in paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

This Declaration does not apply to any dispute in respect of which the parties thereto have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to other means of peaceful settlement for its final and binding decision.

This Declaration shall remain in force for a period of five years and thereafter until it will be terminated or modified by a written declaration.

Done at Vienna on 28 April 1971.

(Signed) Franz Jonas
The Federal President

BARBADOS[16]

1 August 1980

"I have the honour to declare on behalf of the Government of Barbados that -

"The Government of Barbados accepts as compulsory, *ipso facto* , and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 [of the Statute] of the Court until such time as notice might be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the declaration is made, other than:

(a) disputes in regard to which parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(b) disputes with the Government of any other country which is a member of the Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(c) disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of Barbados;

(d) disputes arising out of or concerning jurisdiction or rights claimed or exercised by Barbados in respect of the conservation, management or exploitation of the living resources of the Sea, or in respect of the prevention or control of pollution or contamination of the marine environment in marine areas adjacent to the coast of Barbados.

"Accept, Sir, the assurance of my highest consideration.

(*Signed*) H.deB. Forde
Minister of External Affairs"

BELGIUM[17,18]

17 June 1958

I declare on behalf of the Belgian Government that I recognize as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the Court, in legal disputes arising after 13 July 1948 concerning situations or facts subsequent to that date, except those in regard to which the parties have agreed or may agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

This declaration is made subject to ratification. It shall take effect on the day of deposit of the instrument of ratification for a period of five years. Upon the expiry of that period, it shall continue to have effect until notice of its termination is given. Brussels, 3 April 1958

(Signed) V. Larock
Minister of Foreign Affairs

BOTSWANA[19]

16 March 1970

"I, Sir Seretse Khama, President of the Republic of Botswana, have the honour to declare on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Botswana, that it recognises as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court.

"This Declaration does not extend: "(a) to disputes in respect of which the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another means of peaceful settlement; or "(b) to disputes relating to matters which, by international law, are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the Republic of Botswana."

"The Government of the Republic of Botswana also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification, either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations, or any that may hereafter be added.

"Done at Gaborone this 14th day of January in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seventy.

(Signed) Seretse M. Khama
President"

BULGARIA[20]

24 June 1992

On behalf of the Government of the Republic of Bulgaria, I have the honour to declare that in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice the Republic of Bulgaria recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes arising out of facts and situations subsequent to or continuing to exist after the entry into force of the present Declaration, concerning:

1. the interpretation of a treaty;
2. any question of international law;
3. the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
4. the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation,

except for disputes with any State which has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute less than twelve months prior to filing an application bringing the dispute before the Court or where such acceptance has been made only for the purpose of a particular dispute.

The Republic of Bulgaria also reserves the right at any time to modify the present Declaration, the modifications taking effect six months after the deposit of the notification thereof.

The present Declaration shall be in force for a period of five years from the date of its deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. It shall continue in force thereafter until six months after a notice of its denunciation is given to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Sofia, 26 May 1992

(*Signed*) S. Ganev
The Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Bulgaria

CAMBODIA[21]

19 September 1957

On behalf of the Royal Government of Cambodia I have the honour to declare that, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, I recognize as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State Member of the United Nations, accepting the same obligation, that is to say on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the said Court in all legal disputes, other than:

1. Disputes in regard to which the Parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;
2. Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Kingdom of Cambodia;
3. Disputes relating to any matter excluded from judicial settlement or compulsory arbitration by virtue of any treaty, convention or other international agreement or instrument to which the Kingdom of Cambodia is a party.

This declaration is valid for ten years from the date of its deposit. It shall remain in force thereafter until notice to the contrary has been given by the Royal Government of Cambodia.

Phnom-Penh, 9 September 1957

(*Signed*) Sim Var

CAMEROON[22]

3 March 1994

By order of the Government of the Republic of Cameroon, I have the honour to declare that:

The Government of Cameroon, in accordance with article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes.

This declaration shall remain in force for a period of five years. It shall then continue to have effect unless the Government of the Republic of Cameroon makes a statement to the contrary or submits a written amendment hereto.

(*Signed*) Ferdinand Léopold OYONO
Minister for Foreign Affairs"

CANADA[23]

10 May 1994

"On behalf of the Government of Canada,

(1) I give notice that I hereby terminate the acceptance by Canada of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice hitherto effective by virtue of the declaration made on 10 September 1985 in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court.

(2) I declare that the Government of Canada accepts as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special convention, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the present

declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this declaration, other than:

(a) disputes in regard to which parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(b) disputes with the Government of any other country which is a member of the Commonwealth, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(c) disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of Canada; and (d) disputes arising out of or concerning conservation and management measures taken by Canada with respect to vessels fishing in the NAFO Regulatory Area, as defined in the Convention on Future Multilateral Co-operation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, 1978, and the enforcement of such measures.

(3) The Government of Canada also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification, either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations, or any that may hereafter be added."

New York, May 10, 1994

(Signed) Louise Fréchette

Ambassador and Permanentepresentative

COLOMBIA[5]

[For the declaration *made by Colombia* , see " Declarations made under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice. which are deemed to be acceptances of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice " in section b).]

5 December 2001

I have the honour to inform you on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Colombia that its acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice, as formulated in its declaration of 30 October 1937, and therefore of the International Court of Justice, is terminated with effect from the date of this notification.

The Government of the Republic of Colombia intends to transmit in due course a new declaration accepting the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the formulation of which is to be determined.

Accept, Sir the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Signed) GUILLERMO FERNÁNDEZ DE SOTO

Minister for Foreign Affairs

COSTA RICA[24]

20 February 1973

The Government of Costa Rica recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes of the kinds referred to in Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice. This Declaration shall be valid for a period of five years and shall be understood to be tacitly renewed for like periods, unless denounced before the expiration of the said period.

(Signed) Gonzalo J. Facio

Minister for Foreign Affairs

CÔTE D'IVOIRE

29 August 2001

Concerned on the one hand to ensure the peaceful and equitable settlement of all international disputes, particularly those in which it might be involved, and on the other hand to contribute to the development and strengthening of international law, the Republic of Côte d'Ivoire, pursuant to article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, declares that it recognizes as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes concerning:

(a) The interpretation of a treaty;

(b) Any question of international law;

(c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation;

with the exception of:

1. Disputes concerning which the parties have agreed to have recourse to some other method of settlement;

2. Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall within the exclusive competence of Côte d'Ivoire.

The present declaration has been made for an unlimited period, subject to the power of denunciation and modification attached to any obligation assumed by a State in its international relations.

It will enter into force when it is received by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

(Signed) Sangaré Abou Drahamane

Minister of State

Minister for Foreign Affairs

CYPRUS[25]

3 September 2002

"I have the honour on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus to declare, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, that the Republic of Cyprus accepts as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, over all legal disputes concerning:

(a) the interpretation of any treaty

I. to which the Republic of Cyprus became a party on or after 16 August 1960 or

II. which the Republic of Cyprus recognizes as binding on it by succession;

(b) any question of international law;

(c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation.

(d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

Provided that this declaration shall not apply:

i. To disputes in respect of which any other Party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purpose of the dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other Party to the dispute was deposited or ratified less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court.

ii. To disputes relating to questions which fall within the domestic jurisdiction of the Republic of Cyprus.

2. The Government of Cyprus also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification, either to add to, amend or withdraw this Declaration or

any of the foregoing reservations or any that may hereafter be added."

(Signed) Ioannis Kasoulides
Minister of Foreign Affairs
Nicosia, 3rd September, 2002

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO[12]

8 February 1989

By order of the State Commissioner (Minister) for Foreign Affairs of Zaire, I have the honour to make the following declaration on behalf of the National Executive Council (Government) of the Republic of Zaire, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice:

The Executive Council of the Republic of Zaire recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes concerning:

(a) The interpretation of a treaty; (b) Any question of international law; (c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation; (d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

It is understood further that this declaration will remain in force until notice of its revocation is given.

(Signed) Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative of the Republic of Zaire
to the United Nations

DENMARK[26]

10 December 1956

In conformity with the Royal Decree of 3 December 1956, I have the honour, on behalf of the Danish Government, to make the following declaration:

Pursuant to Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, the Kingdom of Denmark recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement the jurisdiction of the Court in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is to say on condition of reciprocity, for a period of five years from 10 December 1956 and thereafter for further periods of five years, if this declaration is not denounced by notice of not less than six months before the expiration of any five-year period.

New York, 10 December 1956

(Signed) Karl I. Eskelund Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative to the United Nations

DJIBOUTI[27]

2 September 2005

Desiring, on the one hand, to reach a peaceful and equitable settlement of all international disputes, including those in which it may be involved, and, on the other hand, to make a contribution to the further development and consolidation of international law, the Republic of Djibouti, in accordance with Article 36 (2) of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, hereby declares that it recognizes as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes concerning:

(a) The interpretation of a treaty;
(b) Any question of international law;
(c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
(d) The nature and extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation;

with the reservation, however, that this declaration shall not apply to:

1. Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method or methods of settlement;
2. Disputes in regard to matters which are exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of the Republic of Djibouti, under international law;
3. Disputes relating to or connected with facts or situations of hostilities, armed conflicts, individual or collective actions taken in self-defence, resistance to aggression, fulfilment of obligations imposed by international bodies and other similar or related acts, measures or situations in which the Republic of Djibouti is, has been or may in future be involved;
4. Disputes concerning the interpretation or application of a multilateral treaty unless all the parties to the treaty are also parties to the case before the Court or the Government of Djibouti specially agrees to jurisdiction of the Court;
5. Disputes with the Government of any State with which, on the date of an applicatio to bring a dispute before the Court, the Government of Djibouti has no diplomatic relations or which has not been recognized by the Government of Djibouti;
6. Disputes with non-sovereign States or territories;
7. Disputes with the Republic of Djibouti concerning or relating to:
   (a) The status of its territory or the modification or delimitation of its frontiers or any other matter concerning boundaries;
   (b) The territorial sea, the continental shelf and the margins, the exclusive fishery zone, the exclusive economic zone and other zones of national maritime jurisdiction including for the regulation and control of marine pollution and the conduct of scientific research by foreign vessels;
   (c) The condition and status of its islands, bays and gulfs;
   (d) The airspace superjacent to its land and maritime territory; and
   (e) The determination and delimitation of its maritime boundaries.

This declaration is made for a period of five years, without prejudice to the right of denunciation and modification which attaches to any commitment undertaken by the State in its international relations.

It shall take effect on the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Djibouti, 18 July 2005
(Signed) Mahmoud Ali Youssouf
Minister for Foreign Affairs and
International Cooperation

DOMINICA[28]

24 March 2006

"The Commonwealth of Dominica accepts the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and makes this Declaration under article 36 (2) of the Statute of the Court.

This seventeenth day of March 2006. Signature: *(Signed)* The Honourable Ian Douglas Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Dominica and Minister for Legal Affairs *(Signed)* The Honourable Charles Savarin Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Commonwealth of Domininca"

EGYPT[29,30]

2 July 1957

"I, Mahmouds Fawzi, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Egypt, declare on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Egypt, that, in accordance with Article 36 (2) of the Statute of the International Court of Justice and in pursuance and for the purposes of paragraph 9 (b) of the Declaration of the Government of the Republic of Egypt dated April 24, 1957 on the `Suez Canal and the arrangements for its operation', the Government of the Republic of Egypt accept as compulsory, *ipso facto* , on condition of reciprocity and without special agreement, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes that may arise under the said paragraph 9 (b) of the above Declaration dated April 24, 1957, with effect as from that date.

18th July, 1957

(*Signed*) Mahmoud Fawzi"

Estonia[31]

21 October 1991

"I, Arnold Rüütel, Chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Estonia, declare on behalf of the Republic of Estonia and in accordance with the Resolution of September 26, 1991 of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Estonia, that the Republic of Estonia recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, provided that this declaration shall not apply to disputes, the solution of which the parties shall entrust to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence or which may be concluded in the future.

Tallinn

10 October 1991

(Signed) A. Rüütel

Finland[32]

21 June 1958

On behalf of the Finnish Government, I hereby declare that I recognize as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the Court, for a period of five years from 25 June 1958. This declaration shall be renewed by tacit agreement for further periods of the same duration, unless it is denounced not later than six months before the expiry of any such period. This declaration shall apply only to disputes arising in regard to situations or facts subsequent to 25 June 1958.

New York, 25 June 1958

(Signed) G. A. Gripenberg

Permanent Representative of Finland

to the United Nations

Gambia[33]

22 June 1966

"In accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, I declare, on behalf of the Government of Gambia, that the Gambia recognises as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising in the future concerning: "(a) The interpretation of a treaty; "(b) Any question of international law; "(c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation; "(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation; "with the reservation, however, that this declaration does not apply to "(a) Disputes in regard to which the parties have agreed to a settlement other than by recourse to the International Court of Justice; "(b) Disputes with any country in the Commonwealth; "(c) Disputes which, by international law, fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Gambia.

Bathhurst, The Gambia

14th June, 1966

(Signed) A.B. N'jie

Minister of State for External Affairs"

Georgia[34]

20 June 1995

I have the honour on behalf of the Republic of Georgia to declare that, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, the Republic of Georgia recognises as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes referred to in paragraph 2 of article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

Please, accept, Your Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Tbilisi, June 16, 1995

(Signed) Alexander Chikvaidze

Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Georgia

Germany[10]

30 April 2008

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that it recognizes as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, until such time as notice may be given to the Secretary-General of the United Nations withdrawing the declaration and with effect as from the moment of such notification, over all disputes arising after the present declaration, with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this date other than:

(i) any dispute which the Parties thereto have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement or which is subject to another method of peaceful settlement chosen by all the Parties.

(ii) any dispute which

(a) relates to, arises from or is connected with the deployment of armed forces abroad, involvement in such deployments or decisions thereon, or

(b) relates to, arises from or is connected with the use for military purposes of the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany, including its airspace, as well as maritime areas subject to German sovereign rights and jurisdiction;

(iii) any dispute in respect of which any other Party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purpose of the dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other Party to the dispute was deposited or ratified less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court.

2. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany also reserves the right at any time, by means of

a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification, either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations, or any that may hereafter be added.

Accept, Mr. Secretary General, the expression of my highest consideration.

(Signed)
Frank-Walter Steinmeier"

GREECE[35]

10 January 1994

I declare, on behalf of the Greek Government, that I recognize as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes referred to in Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court. However, the Greek Government excludes from the competence of the Court any dispute relating to defensive military action taken by the Hellenic Republic for reasons of national defence.

This declaration shall remain in force for a period of five years. Upon the expiry of that period, it shall continue to have effect until notice of its termination is given.

Athens, 20 December 1993

(Signed) Karolos PAPOULIAS
Minister for Foreign Affairs"

GUINEA[36]

4 December 1998

I have the honour, on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Guinea, to declare that, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, it accepts as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes born since 12 December 1958 and subsequently to the present declaration concerning:

(a) The interpretation of a treaty;
(b) Any question of international law;
(c) Existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

The Republic of Guinea makes this declaration on condition of reciprocity on the part of all States. However, Guinea may waive the competence of the Court in regard to:

(a) Disputes for which the parties have agreed to have recourse to some other method of settlement;
(b) Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall within the exclusive competence of the Republic of Guinea.

Lastly, the Government of the Republic of Guinea reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to withdraw or to amend the present declaration.

Conakry, 11 November 1998

(Signed) LAMINE KAMARA
Minister for Foreign Affaires

GUINEA-BISSAU[37]

7 August 1989

On behalf of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau, I have the honour to declare that, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, the Republic of Guinea-Bissau accepts as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes referred to in Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute thereof.

This declaration will remain in force until six months following the date on which the Government of Guinea-Bissau makes known its intention of terminating it.

Accept, Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Signed) Raul A. de Melo Cabral
Chargé d'affaires *a.i.*

HONDURAS[38]

6 June 1986

The Government of the Republic of Honduras, duly authorized by the National Congress, under Decree No. 75-86 of 21 May 1986, to modify the Declaration made on 20 February 1960 concerning Article 36 (2) of the Statute of the International Court of Justice,

Hereby declares : That it modifies the Declaration made by it on 20 February 1960 as follows:

1. That it recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes concerning:

(a) The interpretation of a treaty;
(b) Any question of international law;
(c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
(d) The nature and extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

2. This Declaration shall not apply, however, to the following disputes to which the Republic of Honduras may be a party: (a) Disputes in respect of which the parties have agreed or may agree to resort to other means for the pacific settlement of disputes; (b) Disputes concerning matters subject to the domestic jurisdiction of the Republic of Honduras under international law; (c) Disputes relating to facts or situations originating in armed conflicts or acts of a similar nature which may affect the territory of the Republic of Honduras, and in which it may find itself involved directly or indirectly;

(d) Disputes referring to: (i) Territorial questions with regard to sovereignty over islands, shoals and keys; internal waters, bays, the territorial sea and the legal status and limits thereof;

(ii) All rights of sovereignty or jurisdiction concerning the contiguous zone, the exclusive economic zone and the continental shelf and the legal status and limits thereof;

(iii) The airspace over the territories, waters and zones referred to in this sub-paragraph.

3. The Govnment of Honduras also reserves the right at any time to supplement, modify or withdraw this Declaration or the reservations contained therein by giving notice to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

4. This Declaration replaces the Declaration made by the Government of Honduras on 20 February 1960.

National Palace, Tegucigalpa, D.C., 22 May 1986.

(Signed) José Azcona H.
President of the Republic
(Signed) Carlos López Contreras
Secretary of the State for Foreign Affairs

HUNGARY[39]

22 October 1992

"The Republic of Hungary hereby recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court in all disputes which may arise in respect of facts or situations subsequent to this declaration, other than:

a) disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

b) disputes in regard to matters which by international law fall exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of the Republic of Hungary;

c) disputes relating to, or connected with, facts or situations of hostilities, war, armed conflicts, individual or collective actions taken in self-defense or the discharge of any functions pursuant to any resolution or recommendation of the United Nations, and other similar or related acts, measures or situations in which the Republic of Hungary is, has been or may in the future be involved;

d) disputes in respect of which any other party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court only in relation to or for the purpose of such dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other party to the dispute was deposited less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect of six months of such notification to amend, add to or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations or any that may hereafter be added.

This declaration shall remain in force until the expiration of six months after notification has been given of its termination.

Budapest, October 7, 1992

(Signed) Géza Jeszenszky

Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Hungary"

INDIA[40]

18 September 1974

I have the honour to declare, on behalf of the Government of the Republic of India, that they accept, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, until such time as notice may be given to terminate such acceptance, as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, and on the basis and condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice over all disputes other than: (1) disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method or methods of settlement; (2) disputes with the Government of any State which is or has been a Member of the Commonwealth of Nations; (3) disputes in regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the Republic of India; (4) disputes relating to or connected with facts or situations of hostilities, armed conflicts, individual or collective actions taken in self-defence, resistance to aggression, fulfilment of obligations imposed by international bodies, and other similar or related acts, measures or situations in which India is, has been or may in future be involved; (5) disputes with regard to which any other party to a dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice exclusively for or in relation to the purposes of such dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of a party to the dispute was deposited or ratified less than 12 months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court; (6) disputes where the jurisdiction of the Court is or may be founded on the basis of a treaty concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations, unless the Government of India specially agree to jurisdiction in each case; (7) disputes concerning the interpretation or application of a multilateral treaty unless all the parties to the treaty are also parties to the case before the Court or Government of India specially agree to jurisdiction; (8) disputes with the government of any State with which, on the date of an application to bring a dispute before the Court, the Government of India has no diplomatic relations or which has not been recognized by the Government of India; (9) disputes with non-sovereign States or territories; (10) disputes with India concerning or relating to: (a) The status of its territory or the modification or delimitation of its frontiers or any other matter concerning boundaries;

(b) the territorial sea, the continental shelf and the margins, the exclusive fishery zone, the exclusive economic zone, and other zones of national maritime jurisdiction including for the regulation and control of marine pollution and the conduct of scientific research by foreign vessels; (c) the condition and status of its islands, bays and gulfs and that of the bays and gulfs that for historical reasons belong to it; (d) the airspace superjacent to its land and maritime territory; and (e) the determination and delimitation of its maritime boundaries. (11) disputes prior to the date of this declaration, including any dispute the foundations, reasons, facts, causes, origins, definitions, allegations or bases of which existed prior to this date, even if they are submitted or brought to the knowledge of the Court hereafter.

2. This declaration revokes and replaces the previous declaration made by the Government of India on 14th September 1959.

(Signed) Swaran Singh

Minister of External Affairs

JAPAN[41]

15 September 1958

"I have the honour, by direction of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, to declare on behalf of the Government of Japan, that in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, Japan recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation and on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, over all disputes which arise on and after the date of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the same date and which are not settled by other means of peaceful settlement.

"This declaration does not apply to disputes which the parties thereto have agreed or shall agree to refer for final and binding decision to arbitration or judicial settlement.

"This declaration shall remain in force for a period of five years and thereafter until it may be terminated by a written notice.

New York, 15 September 1958

(Signed) Koto Matsudaira

Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations"

KENYA[42]

19 April 1965

"I have the honour to declare, on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Kenya, that it accepts, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice until such time as notice may be given to terminate such acceptance, as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, and on the basis and condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction over all disputes arising after 12th December, 1963, with regard to situations or facts subsequent to that date, other than:

1. Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method or methods of settlement;
2. Disputes with the Government of any State which, on the date of this Declaration, is a member of the Commonwealth of Nations or may so become subsequently;
3. Disputes with regard to questions which by general rules of International Law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of Kenya;
4. Disputes concerning any question relating to or arising out of belligerent or military occupation or the discharge of any functions pursuant to any recommendation or decision of an organ of the United Nations, in accordance with which the Government of the Republic of Kenya have accepted obligations.

The Government of the Republic of Kenya reserves the right at any time by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations to add to, amend, or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations. Such notifications shall be effective on the date of their receipt by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

12th April, 1965

(Signed) Joseph Murumbi

Minister for External Affairs"

LESOTHO[43]

6 September 2000

"On behalf of the Kingdom of Lesotho, I have the honour to declare that the Kingdom of Lesotho recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in the relation to any other State which accepts or has accepted the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes referred to in paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

This Declaration does not apply to any dispute the solution of which the parties thereto have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to other means of peaceful settlement for its final and binding decision.

This Declaration shall remain in force until notice of its termination is given.

Accept, Sir, the assurance of my highest consideration.

DATED at Maseru this 31st day of August 2000.

(Signed) Motsoahae Thomas Thabane

Minister of Foreign Affairs"

LIBERIA[44,45]

20 March 1952

"On behalf of the Government of the Republic of Liberia, I, Gabriel L. Dennis, Secretary of State of Liberia, subject to ratification declare that the Republic of Liberia recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State, also a party to the Statute pursuant to Article 93 of the United Nations Charter, which accepts the same obligation (i.e., subject to reciprocity), the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes arising after ratification concerning: "(a) The interpretation of a treaty; "(b) Any question of international law; "(c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation; "(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

"This declaration does not apply: "(a) To any dispute which the Republic of Liberia considers essentially within its domestic jurisdiction; "(b) To any dispute in regard to which the parties have agreed or may agree to bring before other tribunals as a result of agreements already existing or which may be made in the future.

"The present declaration has been made for a period of 5 years as from the date of deposit of the ratification and thereafter until notice of termination is given.

"Done at Monrovia this 3rd day of March 1952.

(Signed) Gabriel L. Dennis

Secretary of State"

LIECHTENSTEIN[46,47]

29 March 1950

The Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein, duly authorized by His Serene Highness, the Reigning Prince François Joseph II, in accordance with the Order of the Diet of the Principality of Liechtenstein dated 9 March 1950, which came into force on 10 March 1950,

Declares by these presents that the Principality of Liechtenstein recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes concerning: (a) The interpretation of a treaty; (b) Any question of international law; (c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation; (d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

The present Declaration, which is made under Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, shall take effect from the date on which the Principality becomes a party to the Statute and shall have effect as long as the Declaration has not been revoked subject to one year's notice.

Done at Vaduz, 10 March 1950.

On behalf of the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein

(Signed) A. Frick

The Head of the Government

LUXEMBOURG

15.IX.30

The Government of the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg recognizes as compulsory, *ipso facto* , and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is to say on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute, in any disputes arising after the signature of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this signature, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another procedure or to another method of pacific settlement. The present declaration is made for a period of five years. Unless it is denounced six months before the expiration of that period, it shall be considered as renewed for a further period of five years and similarly thereafter.

Geneva, 15 September 1930

(Signed)

Bech

MADAGASCAR[48]

2 July 1992

On behalf of the Government of Madagascar, I declare, in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, that Madagascar accepts as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, and until such time as notification is given of the withdrawal of this acceptance, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes concerning:

- the interpretation of a treaty;
- any question of international law;
- the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
- the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

This declaration does not apply:

- to disputes in respect of which the parties have agreed to have recourse to another means of settlement;
- to disputes relating to matters which, by international law, are within the exclusive jurisdiction of Madagascar.

The Government of Madagascar also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the date of receipt of said notification by the Secretary-General, either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations.

Done at Antananarivo on 12 May 1992.

(Signed) Césaire Rabenoro
Minister for Foreign Affairs

MALAWI[49]

12 December 1966

"On behalf of the Government of Malawi, I declare under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice that I recognize as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes which may arise in respect of facts or situations subsequent to this declaration concerning- "(a) The interpretation of a treaty;

"(b) Any question of international law;

"(c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation; "(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of international obligation;

"Provided that this declaration shall not apply to-

(i) Disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the Republic of Malawi as determined by the Government of Malawi;

(ii) Disputes in regard to which the parties of the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement; or

(iii) Disputes concerning any question relating to or arising out of belligerent or military occupation.

"The Government of Malawi also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to add to, amend, or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations or any that may hereafter be added. Such notifications shall be effective on the date of their receipt by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

"Given under my hand in Zomba this 22nd day of November 1966.

(Signed) H. Kamuzu Banda
President and Minister for External Affairs"

MALTA[50]

6 December 1966

The Government of Malta accepts as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special convention, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes other than: (i) disputes in regard to which the Parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement; (ii)

disputes with the Government of any other country which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree; (iii)

disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of Malta; (iv) disputes concerning any question relating to or arising out of belligerent or military occupation or the discharge of any functions pursuant to any recommendation or decision of an organ of the United Nations, in accordance with which the Government of Malta have accepted obligations; (v)

disputes arising under a multilateral treaty unless (1) all Parties to the treaty affected by the decision are also Parties to the case before the Court, or (2) the Government of Malta specially agrees to jurisdiction;

(vi) disputes relating to any matter excluded from compulsory adjudication or arbitration under any treaty, convention or other international agreement or instrument to which Malta is a party; (vii)

disputes in respect of which arbitral or judicial proceedings are taking, or have taken place with any State which, at the date of the commencement of the proceedings, had not itself accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice; and

(viii) disputes in respect of which any other Party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purposes of the dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other Party to the dispute was deposited or ratified less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court.

The Government of Malta also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations or any that may hereafter be added.

29 November 1966.

(Signed) G. Felice
Minister *ad interim*

2 September 1983

I have the honour to refer to the Declaration made by the Government of Malta on 29 November 1966, and notified on 6 December 1966, concerning the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and to give notice that, with effect from the moment this notification is received by Your Excellency, the acceptance of the Government of Malta of the jurisdiction of the Court shall be limited to all disputes with Malta other than - (1) the disputes mentioned in paragraphs (i) to (viii), both inclusive, of the Declaration; and (2) the following categories of disputes, that is to say: "disputes with Malta concerning or relating to: (a) its territory, including the territorial sea, and the status thereof; (b)

the continental shelf or any other zone of maritime jurisdiction, and the resources thereof; (c)

the determination or delimitation of any of the above; (d) the prevention or control of pollution or contamination of the marine environment in marine areas adjacent to the coast of Malta."

The Government of Malta also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect from the moment of such notification, either to add to, aend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations or any that may hereafter be added.

(Signed) Alex Sceberras Trigona
Minister of Foreign Affairs

MAURITIUS[51]

23 September 1968

"I have the honour to declare, on behalf of the Government of Mauritius, that Mauritius accepts as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special convention, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes other than: "(i) Disputes in regard to which the Parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement; "(ii) Disputes with the Government of any other country which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree; "(iii) Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of Mauritius; "(iv) Disputes concerning any question relating to or arising out of belligerent or military occupation or the discharge of any functions pursuant to any recommendation or decision of an organ of the United Nations, in accordance with which the Government of Mauritius has accepted obligations; "(v) Disputes relating to any matter excluded from compulsory adjudication or arbitration under any treaty, convention or other international agreement or instrument to which Mauritius is a party; "(vi) Disputes in respect of which arbitral or judicial proceedings are taking, or have taken place with any State which, at the date of the commencement of the proceedings, had not itself accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice; and "(vii) Disputes in respect of which any other Party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purposes of the dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of anyher Party to the dispute was deposited or ratified less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court.

"The Government of Mauritius also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations or any that may hereafter be added.

Port Louis, 4 September 1968

(Signed) S. Ramgoolam
Prime Minister and Minister for External Affairs"

MEXICO[52]

28 October 1947

In regard to any legal dispute that may in future arise between the United States of Mexico and any other State out of events subsequent to the date of this Declaration, the Mexican Government recognizes as compulsory, *ipso facto* , and without any special agreement being required therefore, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the said Court, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is, on condition of strict reciprocity. This Declaration which does not apply to disputes arising from matters that, in the opinion of the Mexican Government, are within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of Mexico, shall be binding for a period of five years as from 1 March 1947 and after that date shall continue in force until six months after the Mexican Government gives notice of denunciation.

Mexico, D.F., 23 October 1947

(Signed) Jaime Torres Bodet
Secretary of State for External Relations

NETHERLANDS[53,54]

1 August 1956

I hereby declare that the Government of the Kingdom of The Netherlands recognizes, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, with effect from 6 August 1956, as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the said Court in all disputes arising or which may arise after 5 August 1921, with the exception of disputes in respect of which the parties, excluding the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, may have agreed to have recourse to some other method of pacific settlement.

The aforesaid obligation is accepted for a period of five years and will be renewed by tacit agreement for additional periods of five years, unless notice is given, not less than six months before the expiry of any such period, that the Government of the Kingdom of The Netherlands does not wish to renew it.

The acceptance of the jurisdiction of the Court founded on the declaration of 5 August 1946 is terminated with effect from 6 August 1956.

New York, 1 August 1956

(Signed) E. L. C. Schiff
Acting Permanent Representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the United Nations

NEW ZEALAND[55]

22 September 1977

"(I) The acceptance by the Government of New Zealand of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice by virtue of the Declaration made on 1 April 1940 under Article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, and made applicable to the International Court of Justice by paragraph 5 of Article 36 of the Statute of that Court, is hereby terminated: (II) The Government of New Zealand accepts as compulsory, *ipso facto* , and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Court over all disputes other than: 1 Disputes in regard to which the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement: 2 Disputes in respect of which any other party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purpose of the dispute: or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other party to the dispute was deposited or ratified less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court: 3 Disputes arising out of or concerning the jurisdiction or rights claimed or exercised by New Zealand in respect of the exploration, exploitation, conservation or management of the living resources in marine areas beyond and adjacent to the territorial sea of New Zealand but within 200 nautical miles from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured.

This Declaration shall remain in force for a period of five years from 22 September 1977 and thereafter until the expiration of six months after notice has been given of the termination of this Declaration provided that the Government of New Zealand reserves the right at any time to amend this Declaration in the light of the results of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in respect of the settlement of disputes.

(Signed) M.J.C. Templeton
Permanent Representative of New Zealand to the United Nations"

NICARAGUA[56]

[For the declaration made by Nicaragua , see " Declarations made under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice. which are deemed to be acceptances of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice " in section b).

24 October 2001

"I have the honour to inform you and, through you, all the States parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice and the Secretariat of the Court, of the reservation made to Nicaragua's voluntary acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice by Presidential Decision No. 335-2001 of 22 October 2001, issued by the President of the Republic, Mr. Arnoldo Alemán Lacayo, the text of which is as follows:

'Nicaragua will not accept the jurisdiction or competence of the International Court of Justice in relation to any matter or claim based on interpretations of treaties or arbitral awards that were signed and ratified or made, respectively, prior to 31 December 1901.'

Accept, Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Signed) Francisco X. Aguirre Sacasa"

9 January 2002

Objection to the reservation made by Nicaragua:

On 9 January 2002, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Costa Rica a communication transmitting the formal objection to the reservation formulated by the Government of Nicaragua.[See note 1 under "Costa Rica" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.}

NIGERIA[57]

30 April 1998

"I have the honour, on behalf of the Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, to declare that the acceptance by the Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice by virtue of the Declaration made on 14th August, 1965 under Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, is hereby amended so as to read as set out in the following paragraph;

In conformity with paragraph 2 of article 36 of the Statute, the Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria accepts as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court over all legal disputes referred to in that paragraph of the Statute other than;

(i) disputes in respect of which any party to the dispute has accepted the jurisdiction of the Court by a Declaration deposited less than Twelve Months prior to the filing of an Application bringing the dispute before the Court after the date of this amended Declaration;

(ii) disputes in respect of which any party has filed an Application in substitution for or in lieu of all or any part of any Application to which sub-paragraph (i) refers;

(iii) disputes relating to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the Federal Republic of Nigeria;

(iv) disputes in respect of which any other party to the dispute has accepted the jurisdiction of the Court only in relation to or for the purposes of the dispute;

(v) disputes in regard to which the parties have agreed or agree to have recourse to any other method of peaceful settlement;

(vi) disputes relating to or connected with facts or situations of hostilities or armed conflict, whether internal or international in character;

(vii) disputes with any State with which the Government of Nigeria does not have diplomatic relations;

(viii) disputes concerning the allocation, delimitation or demarcation of territory (whether land, maritime, lacustrine or superjacent air space) unless the Government of Nigeria specially agrees to such jurisdiction and within the limits of any such special agreement.

(ix) disputes in relation to matters which arose prior to the date of Nigeria's independence, including any dispute the causes, origins or bases of which arose prior to that date.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria further reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect from the moment of such notification, to add to, amend or withdraw this Declaration or the reservations contained therein or any that may hereafter be added.

Done at Abuja, this 29th day of April 1998
(Signed) Chief Tom Ikimi
Hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs
Federal Republic of Nigeria"

NORWAY[58]

24 June 1996

"I hereby declare on behalf of the Royal Norwegian Government that Norway recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, for a period of five years as from 3 October 1976. This declaration shall thereafter be tacitly renewed for additional periods of five years, unless notice of termination is given not less than six months before the expiration of the current period; provided, however, that the limitations and exceptions relating to the settlement of disputes pursuant to the provisions of, and the Norwegian declarations applicable at any given time to, the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 and the Agreement of 4 December 1995 for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks, shall apply to all disputes concerning the law of the sea."

(Signed) Hans Jacob Biorn Lian
Permanent Representative of Norway to the United Nations"

PAKISTAN[59]

13 September 1960

"I have the honour, by direction of the President of Pakistan, to make the following declaration on behalf of the Government of Pakistan under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice:

"The Government of Pakistan recognize as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes after the 24th June, 1948, arising, concerning: "(a) The interpretation of a treaty; "(b) Any question of international law; "(c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation; "(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation;

"Provided, that the declaration shall not apply to: "(a) Disputes the solution of which the parties shall entrust to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence or which may be concluded in the future; or "(b) Disputes relating to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of Pakistan; "(c) Disputes arising under a multilateral treaty unless "(i) All parties to the treaty affected by the decision are also parties to the case before the Court, or "(ii) The Government of Pakistan specially agree to jurisdiction; and

"provided further, that this Declaration shall remain in force till such time as notice may be given to terminate it."

Pakistan Mission to the United Nations New York,
September 12th, 1960

(Signed) Said Hasan
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Permanent
Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations"

PARAGUAY[60]

25 September 1996

I HEREBY ACCEPT on behalf of the Government of Paraguay the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, with headquarters at The Hague, reciprocally in relation to other States accepting the same obligation in respect of all disputes as provided for in Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court. The present declaration shall apply only to disputes arising subsequent to the date of this declaration.

(Signed) Rubén MELGAREJO LANZONI
Minister for Foreign Affairs
(Signed) Juan Carlos WASMOSY
President

PERU[61]

7 July 2003

In accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, the Government of Peru recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation and on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes, until such time as it may give notice withdrawing this declaration.

This declaration does not apply to any dispute with regard to which the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to arbitration or judicial settlement for a final and binding decision or which has been settled by some other method of peaceful settlement.

The Government of Peru reserves the right at any time by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations to amend or withdraw this declaration or reservations set out herein. Such notification shall take effect on the day on which it is received by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

This declaration shall apply to countries that have entered reservations or set conditions with respect to it, with the same restrictions as set by such countries in their respective declarations.

Lima, 9 April 2003

(Signed) Allan Wagner Tiz6n
Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Peru

PHILIPPINES[62]

18 January 1972

"I, Carlos P. Romulo, Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of the Philippines, hereby declare, under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, that the Republic of the Philippines recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes arising hereafter concerning: "(a) The interpretation of a treaty; "(b) Any question of international law; "(c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation; "(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation;

Provided, that this declaration shall not apply to any dispute: "(a) In regard to which the parties thereto have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement; or "(b) Which the Republic of the Philippines considers to be essentially within its domestic jurisdiction; or "(c) In respect of which the other party has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purposes of such dispute; or where the acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction was deposited or ratified less than 12 months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court; or "(d) Arising under a multilateral treaty, unless (l) all parties to the treaty are also parties to the case before the Court, or (2) the Republic of the Philippines specially agrees to jurisdiction; or "(e) Arising out of or concerning jurisdiction or rights claimed or exercised by the Philippines: "(i) In respect of the natural resources, including living organisms belonging to sedentary species, of the sea-bed and subsoil of the continental shelf of the Philippines, or its analogue in anarchipelago, as described in Proclamation No. 370 dated 20 March 1968 of the President of the Republic of the Philippines; or "(ii) In respect of the territory of the Republic of the Philippines, including its territorial seas and inland waters; and

"Provided further, that this declaration shall remain in force until notice is given to the Secretary-General of the United Nations of its termination.

Done at Manila this 23rd day of December 1971.

(Signed) Carlos Pi Romulo Secretary of Foreign Affairs"

POLAND[63]

25 March 1996

"The Republic of Poland shall recognize with the effect as of 25 September 1996, in accordance with the provisions of [article 36] as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation and subject to the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes other than:

a) disputes prior to 25 September 1990 or disputes arisen out of facts or situations prior to the same date;

b) disputes with regard to the territory or State boundaries;

c) disputes with regard to environmental protection;

d) disputes with regard to foreign liabilities or debts;

e) disputes with regard to any State which has made a declaration accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the

International Court of Justice less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court;

f) disputes in respect whereof parties have agreed, or shall agree, to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

g) disputes relating to matters which, by international law, fall exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of the Republic of Poland.

The Government of the Republic of Poland also reserves its right to withdraw or modify the present Declaration at any time and by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, taking effect after six months from the moment whereof.

25 March 1996.

(Signed) Dariusz ROSATI
Minister for Foreign Affairs"

PORTUGAL[13,64]

25 February 2005

"On behalf of the Portuguese Republic, I declare and give notice that Portugal, continuing to accept the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, amends its declaration made on 19 December 1955, replacing its terms by the following:

1. Under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, the Portuguese Republic recognizes the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation (and to the extent it accepts it), until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, in all legal disputes other than:

(i) any dispute which Portugal has agreed or shall agree with the other party or parties thereto to settle by some other method of peaceful settlement;

(ii) any dispute with any State that has deposited or ratified the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction or an amendment thereto so that the dispute became included in its scope less than twelve months prior to the filling of the application bringing the dispute before the Court;

(iii) any dispute, unless it refers to territorial titles or rights or to sovereign rights or jurisdiction, arising before 26 April 1974 or concerning situations or facts prior to that date;

(iv) any dispute with a party or parties to a treaty regarding which the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice has, under the applicable rules, been explicitly excluded, irrespective of whether the scope of the dispute refers to the interpretation and application of the treaty provisions or to other sources of international law.

2. The Portuguese Republic also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification, either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations, or any that may hereafter be added,"

SENEGAL[65]

2 December 1985

I have the honour, on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Senegal, to declare that, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, it accepts on condition of reciprocity as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes born subsequently to the present declaration concerning:

- the interpretation of a treaty;
- any question of international law;
- existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
- the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

This declaration is made on condition of reciprocity on the part of all States. However, Senegal may waive the competence of the Court in regard to:

- disputes concerning which the parties have agreed to have recourse to some other method of settlement;
- disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall within the exclusive competence of Senegal.

Lastly, the Government of the Republic of Senegal reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to add, to amend or to withdraw the foregoing reservations.

Such notification shall be effective on the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General.

(Signed) Ibrahim FALL
Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Senegal"

SLOVAKIA[66]

28 May 2004

"On behalf of the Slovak Republic I have the honour to declare that the Slovak Republic recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court over all legal disputes arising after the date of signature of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the same date.

This declaration does not apply to disputes:

(1) Which the parties have agreed to settle by some other method of peaceful settlement;

(2) in respect of which any other Party to the dispute has accepted the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purpose of the dispute; or when the declaration recognizing the jurisdiction of the Court on behalf of any other Party to the dispute was deposited less than twelve months prior to the filing of the unilateral application bringing the dispute before the Court;

(3) with regard to the protection of environment;

(4) with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of the Slovak Republic.

The Slovak republic reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the date of receipt of such notification, to amend or withdraw this declaration.

Done at Bratislava on 11 May 2004

(Signed)
Rudolf Schuster
President of the Slovak Republic"

SOMALIA[67]

11 April 1963

"I have the honour to declare on behalf of the Government of the Somali Republic that the Somali Republic accepts as compulsory *ipso facto*, and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, until such times as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all legal disputes arising other than disputes in respect of which any other Party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purposes of the dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other Party to the dispute was deposited or ratified less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court.

"The Somali Republic also reserves the right at any time by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification, either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations, or any that may hereafter be added.

Mogadishu
March 25, 1963.

(Signed) Abdullahi Issa
Minister for Foreign Affairs"

SPAIN[68]

29 October 1990

The Kingdom of Spain accepts as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, on condition of reciprocity, in legal disputes not included among the following situations and exceptions:

a) Disputes in regard to which the Kingdom of Spain and the other party or parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement of dispute;

b) Disputes in regard to which the other party or parties have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court only in relation to or for the purposes of the dispute in question;

c) Disputes in regard to which the other party or parties have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court less than 12 months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court;

d) Disputes arising prior to the date on which this Declaration was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations or relating to events or situations which occurred prior to that date, even if such events or situations may continue to occur or to have effects thereafter.

2. The Kingdom of Spain may at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, add to, amend or withdraw, in whole or in part, the foregoing reservations or any that may hereafter be added. These amendments shall become effective on the date of their receipt by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

3. The present Declaration, which is deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 4, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, shall remain in force until such time as it has been withdrawn by the Spanish Government or superseded by another declaration by the latter.

The withdrawal of the Declaration shall become effective after a period of six months has elapsed from the date of receipt by the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the relevant notification by the Spanish Government. However, in respect of States which have established a period of less than six months between notification of the withdrawal of their Declaration and its becoming effective, the withdrawal of the Spanish Declaration shall become effective after such shorter period has elapsed.

Done at Madrid on 15 October 1990.

(Signed) Francisco Fernandez Ordoñez
Minister for Foreign Affairs

SUDAN[69]

2 January 1958

"I have the honour by direction of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to declare, on behalf of the Government of the Republic of the Sudan, that in pursuance of paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice the Government of the Republic of the Sudan recognize as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, until such time as notice may be given to terminate this Declaration, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes arising after the first day of January 1956 with regard to situations or facts subsequent to that date concerning:

"(a) The interpretation of a treaty concluded or ratified by the Republic of the Sudan on or after the first day of January 1956; "(b) Any question of International Law; "(c) The existence of any fact, which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation; or "(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation;

"but excluding the following: "(i) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement; "(ii) Disputes in regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the Republic of the Sudan as determined by the Government of the Republic of the Sudan;

"(iii)Disputes arising out of events occurring during any period in which the Republic of the Sudan is engaged in hostilities as a belligerent.

30 December, 1957

(Signed) Yacoub Osman
Permanent Representative of the Sudan
to the United Nations"

SURINAME[70]

31 August 1987

"I have the honour by direction of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Suriname, to declare on behalf of the Government of Suriname:

The Government of the Republic of Suriname recognizes, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, with effect from the seventh September 1987, as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the said Court in all disputes, which have arisen prior to this Declaration or may arise after this Declaration, with the exception of:

A. disputes, which have arisen or may arise with respect to or in relation with the borders of the Republic of Suriname;

B. disputes in respect of which the parties, excluding the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, have agreed to settlement by means of arbitration, mediation or other methods of conciliation and accommodation.

This declaration shall be binding for a period of five years and shall continue in force after that period until twelve months after the Government of the Republic of Suriname has given notice of its termination.

(Signed) W. H. Werner Vreedzaam
Chargé d'Affaires of the Permanent Mission of
the Republic of Suriname to the United Nations"

SWAZILAND[71]

26 May 1969

"I, Prince Makhosini Jameson Dlamini, Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Swaziland to whom His Majesty has delegated responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs, have the honour to declare on behalf of the Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland, that it recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court.

"This Declaration does not extend: "(a) To disputes in respect of which the parties have agreed to have recourse to another means of peaceful settlement; or "(b) To disputes relating to matters which, by international law, are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the Kingdom of Swaziland.

"The Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland also reserves the right to add to, amend or withdraw this Declaration by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, with effect as from the moment of such notification.

Mbabane, 9th May, 1969

(Signed) Makhosini Jameson Dlamini
Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs"

SWEDEN[72]

6 April 1957

On behalf of the Royal Swedish Government, I declare that it accepts as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the said Court for a period of five years as from 6 April 1957. This obligation shall be renewed by tacit agreement for further periods of the same duration unless notice of abrogation is made at least six months before the expiration of any such period. The above-mentioned obligation is accepted only in respect of disputes which may arise with regard to situations or facts subsequent to 6 April 1957.

New York, 6 April 1957

(Signed) Claes Carbonnier
Permanent Representative *a.i.*
of Sweden to the United Nations

SWITZERLAND[73,74]

28 July 1948

The Swiss Federal Council

Duly authorized for that purpose by a Federal Order which was adopted on 12 March 1948 by the Federal Assembly of the Swiss Confederation and entered into force on 17 June 1948,

Hereby declares

That the Swiss Confederation recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes concerning:

a. The interpretation of a treaty;
b. Any question of international law;
c. The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
d. The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

This declaration which is made under Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice shall take effect from the date on which the Swiss Confederation becomes a party to that Statute and shall have effect as long as it has not been abrogated subject to one year's notice.

Done at Berne, 6 July 1948.

On behalf of the Swiss Federal Council,

(Signed) Celio
The President of the Confederation
(Signed) Leimgruber
The Chancellor of the Confederation

TOGO[75]

25 October 1979

The Togolese Republic,

Represented by His Excellency Mr. Akanyi-Awunyo Kodjovi, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative of Togo to the United Nations,

Acting pursuant to the provisions of Article 36, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, annexed to the Charter of the United Nations,

Guided by its constant concern to ensure the peaceful and equitable settlement of all international disputes, particularly those in which it might be involved, and desiring to contribute to the strengthening of the international legal order based on the principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations,

Declares that it recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is, subject to reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all disputes concerning: (a) The interpretation of a treaty; (b) Any question of international law; (c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation; (d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

The present declaration has been made for an unlimited period subject to the power of denunciation and modification attached to any obligation assumed by a sovereign State in its international relations. It will enter into force on the day on which it is received by the United Nations Secretariat.

New York, 24 October 1979

(Signed) Akanyi-Awunyo Kodjovi

UGANDA[76]

3 October 1963

"I hereby declare on behalf of the Government of Uganda that Uganda recognises as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, and on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court.

New York, 3rd October 1963

(Signed) Apollo K. Kironde
Ambassador and Permanent Representative
of Uganda to the United Nations"

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND[77]

5 July 2004

"1. The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland accept as compulsory ipso facto and without special convention, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after 1 January 1974, with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the same date, other than:

(i) any dispute which the United Kingdom has agreed with the other Party or Parties thereto to settle by some other method of peaceful settlement;

(ii) any dispute with the government of any other country which is or has been a Member of the Commonwealth;

(iii) any dispute in respect of which any other Party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purpose of the dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other Party to the dispute was deposited or ratified less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court.

2. The Government of the United Kingdom also reserve the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification, either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations, or any that may hereafter be added."

(Signed) Emyr Jones Parry

(b) Declarations made under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice. which are deemed to be acceptances of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice (All data and footnotes concerning these declarations are reprinted from the International Court of Justice Yearbook, 1971-1972.)

COLOMBIA[5]

30.X.37

The Republic of Colombia recognizes as compulsory, ipso facto and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice, in accordance with Article 36 of the Statute.

The present Declaration applies only to disputes arising out of facts subsequent to January 6th, 1932.

Geneva, 30 October 1937.

(Signed) J. M. Yepes
Legal Adviser of the Permanent Delegation
of Colombia to the League of Nations

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

30.IX.24

On behalf of the Government of the Dominican Republic and subject to ratification, I recognize, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, ipso facto and without special convention.

Geneva, 30 September 1924.

(Signed)
Jacinto R. de Castro

The instrument of ratification was deposited on 4 February 1933.

HAITI

4.X.21

On behalf of the Republic of Haiti, I recognize the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice as compulsory.

(Signed) F. Addor
Consul

LUXEMBOURG[78]

15.IX.30

The Government of the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg recognizes as compulsory, *ipso facto* , and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is to say on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute, in any disputes arising after the signature of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this signature, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another procedure or to another method of pacific settlement. The present declaration is made for a period of five years. Unless it is denounced six months before the expiration of that period, it shall be considered as renewed for a further period of five years and similarly thereafter.

Geneva, 15 September 1930
(Signed)
Bech

NICARAGUA[79]

24.IX.29

On behalf of the Republic of Nicaragua, I recognize as compulsory unconditionally the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

Geneva, 24 September 1929
(Signed) T. F. Medina

PANAMA[80]

25.X.21

On behalf of the Government of Panama, I recognize, in relation to any other Member or State which accepts the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without any special convention.

Paris, 25 October 1921

(Signed) Ri A. Amador
Chargé d'Affaires

URUGUAY[81,82]

Prior to 28.I.21

On behalf of the Government of Uruguay, I recognize in relation to any Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special convention.

(Signed) B. Fernandez Y. Medina

Notes:

[1] A declaration recognizing as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice had been deposited on 26 October 1946 with the Secretary-General on behalf of the Republic of China (registered under No. 5. For the text of that declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. l, p. 35). In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 5 December 1972, the Government of the People's Republic of China indicated that it does not recognize the statement made by the defunct Chinese government on 26 October 1946 in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice concerning the acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

[2] In its resolution 47/1 of 22 September 1992, the General Assembly, acting upon the recommendation of the Security Council in its resolution 777 (1992) of 19 September 1992, considered that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, today Serbia (see note 2 under "Yugoslavia", note 1 under "Serbia and Montenegro" and note 1 under "Serbia" in the Historical Information Section of this publication), could not continue automatically the membership of the former Yugoslavia in the United Nations, and decided that it should accordingly apply for membership in the Organization. The Legal Counsel, however, took the view at that time that this resolution of the General Assembly neither terminated or suspended the membership of the former Yugoslavia in the United Nations, and that the Secretary-General, as depositary, was not in a position either to reject or to disregard the claim of Serbia that it continued the legal personality of the former Yugoslavia (see document A/47/485). For more information in this regard, see note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" in the Historical Information Section of this publication.

Against this background, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, by its note of 25 April 1999, submitted a declaration recognizing as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, which was deposited with the Secretary-General on 26 April 1999. Article 36, paragraph 2 limits such declarations to the parties to the Statute. Parties to the Statute include all members of the United Nations, pursuant to Article 93(1) of the United Nations Charter.

The text of the declaration reads as follows:

26 April 1999

I hereby declare that the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia recognizes, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to anyother State accepting the same obligation, that is on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the said Court in all disputes arising or which may arise after the signature of the present Declaration, with regard to the situations or facts subsequent to this signature except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another procedure or to another method of pacific settlement. The present Declaration does not apply to disputes relating to questions which, under international law, fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, as well as to territorial disputes.

The aforesaid obligation is accepted until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance.

(Signed) Vladislav Jovanovic

Chargé d'affaires a.i. of

the Permanent Mission of

Yugoslavia to the United Nations

New York, 25 April 1999

Following the admission of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to the United Nations on 1 November 2000, pursuant to General Assembly resolution A/55/528, a review was undertaken of the multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General, in relation to many of which the former Yugoslavia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia had undertaken a range of treaty actions. With respect to the status of the declaration by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia recognizing as compulsory the jurisdiction of the Court, which was deposited on 26 April 1999, the depositary decided to await the outcome of matters which were then pending before the Court.

In a letter dated 31 January 2007, the Registrar of the Court notified the depositary that in its Judgment of 15 December 2004 the Court concluded that Serbia and Montenegro was not a member of the United Nations and therefore was not a party to the Statute of the Court at the time that it filed its application to institute the proceedings before the Court on 29 April 1999. In the light of the above-mentioned letter from the Registrar of the Court clarifying the status of Serbia with respect to the Statute, and after confirmation from Serbia on 13 May 2008, that it did not recognize the declaration of 26 April 1999 made by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the name of Serbia was removed from the list of States which have made declarations under Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute.

See note 1 under "Serbia" in the Historical Information section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] In a notification received by the Secretary-General on 21 November 1985, the Government of Israel gave notice of the termination of the declaration of 17 October 1956. For the text of the declaration see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 252, p. 301. The declaration of 17 October 1956 replaced that of 4 September 1950, which was published in the United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 108, p. 239. An amending declaration was received on 28 February 1984 and registered on that date under No. 3571. See United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1349, p. 326.

The notification of termination of the declaration of 17 October 1956 received from the Government of Israel on 21 November 1985 (dated 19 November 1985), reads as follows:

"On behalf of the Government of Israel, I have the honour to inform you that the Government of Israel has decided to terminate, with effect as of today, its declaration of 17 October 1956 as amended, concerning the acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice."

Benjamin Netanyahu

Ambassador

[4] In a notification received by the Secretary-General on 10 January 1974, the Government of France gave notice of the

termination of the declaration of 20 May 1966 (registered under No. 8196). For the text of that declaration and for the notice of termination, see United Nations, *Treaty Serie* s, vol. 562, p. 71 and vol. 907, p. 129, respectively. For the text of the declaration made on 10 July 1959 (registered under No. 4816, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 337, p. 65.

[5] On 30 October 1937, the Government of Colombia deposited an instrument of ratification. Ratification was not required under the terms of the Optional Clause, the act of signature itself sufficing to make the undertaking binding except where the declaration had been made expressly subject to ratification. Nevertheless, certain States, which had signed without any such reservation, subsequently ratified their declaration. The declaration of 5 December 2001 was registered under No. 37819, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 2166, p. 3.

[6] Registered under No. 36941; see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 2121, p. 193. In this regard, the Secretary-General received on 28 May 1999, the following communication from the Governments of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: "[The Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Government of the Republic of Croatia, the Government of the Republic of Slovenia and the Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia] should like to refer to [...] the Declaration under Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice made by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) on 25 April 1999. [The Declaration] states that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) lodged the [declaration] by which it recognised the jurisdiction ipso facto , of the said Court in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the Court. [The Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Government of the Republic of Croatia, the Government of the Republic of Slovenia and the Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia] would like to express [their] disagreement with the content of the above-quoted [Declaration]. The [Declaration] can have no legal effect whatsoever, because the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) is not a State Member of the United Nations, nor is it a State Party to the Statute of the Court, that could make a valid declaration under Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the Court. Consequently, there was no legal basis for acceptance or circulation of the invalid document in question. In this connection, [The Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Government of the Republic of Croatia, the Government of the Republicof Slovenia and the Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia] would once again like to draw the attention to the Security Council's resolution 777 (1992) and the General Assembly's resolution 47/1 (1992) . Both of these resolutions explicitly stated that the state known as the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia had ceased to exist and that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) could not automatically continue the membership of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in the United Nations and that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) should apply for membership in the United Nations. Until the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) has complied with the requirements of those resolutions, it could not be considered as a State Member of the United Nations. Since a new application for membership in the United Nations, pursuant to Article 4 of the Charter, has not been made by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) to date, and it has not been admitted to the United Nations, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia therefore cannot be considered to be ipso facto a party to the Statute of the Court by virtue of Article 93, paragraph 1 of the Charter of the United Nations. Neither has the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) become a Contracting party of the Statute of the Court under Article 93, paragraph 2, which states that a non-member State can only become a Contracting Party of the International Court of Justice's Statute under conditions set by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Security Council on a case by case basis. Furthermore, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) has not accepted the jurisdiction of the Court under the conditions provided for in Security Council Resolution 9 of 15 October 1946, and adopted by the Security Council by virtue of powers conferred on it by Article 35, paragraph 3, of the Statute of the Court. The reference to "Yugoslavia (Original member)" in the list of States Members of the United Nations entitled to appear before the Court pursuant to Article 35, para 1, of the Statute of the Court and Article 93, paragraph 1, of the United Nations Charter (I.C.J. Yearbook 1996-1997) refers to the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY) and not to one of its successor States. By using the abbreviated name "Yugoslavia" the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) deliberately manipulates the situation and tries to create an erroneous assumption that the State party to the Statute, namely Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, is the same as one of the five successor States, namely the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), only. Because the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), which made the declaration under Article 32, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the Court is not the same legal entity under international law as a State which was the original Party to the Statute of the Court, namely, Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia, it is the opinion of our Governments that the notification is null and void." See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 12 April 1967, the Government of South Africa gave notice of withdrawal and termination, with effect from that date, of the declaration of 12 September 1955 (registered under No. 2935). For the text of the said declaration, which was deposited with the Secretary-General on 13 September 1955, and for the notice of termination, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 216, p. 115, and vol. 595, p. 363, respectively.

[8] The declarations recognizing as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice deposited with the Secretary-General by the Governments of Bolivia, Brazil, El Salvador, Guatemala, Nauru, Thailand and Turkey were made for specified periods of time which have since expired. For the text of those declarations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 16, p. 207 (Bolivia, registered under No. 261); vol. 15, p. 221 (Brazil, registered under No. 237); vol. 899, p. 99 (El Salvador, registered under No. 12837. Subsequently, a declaration was received on 3 July 1974 from the Government of Honduras objecting to the declaration made by El Salvador and, on 9 September 1974, a second declaration was received from the Government of El Salvador, both registered under No. 12837 and published in vols. 942 and 948, respectively. The Government of El Salvador, by notification received on 27

November 1978, extended its acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice for a period of 10 years as from 26 November 1978 with the following declaration: El Salvador still reserves the right at any time to modify, add to, explain or derogate from the exceptions under which it accepted such jurisdiction. The declaration was registered on 27 November 1978 under No. 12837 and published in vol. 1119, p. 382. For El Salvador's declaration recognizing the compulsory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice, see *Yearbook of the International Court of Justice* 1972-1973, p. 39); vol. 1, p. 49 (Guatemala, registered under No. 12); vol. 1491, p. 199 (Nauru, registered under No. 25640, renewed and extended for a period of five years as from 29 January 1993); vol. 65, p. 157 (Thailand, registered under No. 844), and vol. 4, p. 265 (Turkey, registered under No. 50) and vol. 191, p. 357, vol. 308, p. 301, vol. 491, p. 385, and vol. 604, p. 349 (Turkey, renewals).

[9] Registered under No. 3; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. l, p. 9. A declaration of 6 April 1984 was made by the United States of America modifying the said declaration and was registered on that date under No. 3. For the text of the declaration as modified, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1354, p. 452. Subsequently, In a notification received by the Secretary-General on 7 October 1985, the Government of the United States of America gave notice of the termination of its declaration of 26 August 1946, which was registered on 7 October and published in vol. 1408, p. 270.

[10] Registered on 1 May 2008 under No. 44914.

[11] State having made a declaration under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

[12] Registered under No. 26437; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1523, p.299

[13] See note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portugal" regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[14] Registered under No. 38245. This declaration replaces that of 17 March 1975 registered under No. 13809, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 961, p. 183. For the declaration of 6 February 1954 registered under No. 2484, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 186, p. 77.

[15] Registered under No. 11092; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 778, p. 301.

[16] Registered under No. 19017; see United Nations, *Treatv Series,* vol. 1197, p. 7.

[17] The instrument of ratification was deposited on 17 June 1958.

[18] Registered under No. 4364; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 302, p. 251. The previous declaration, registered under No. 260 and valid for a period of five years, was deposited by Belgium on 13 July 1948: see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 16, p. 203.

[19] Registered under No. 10359; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 721, p. 121.

[20] Registered under No. 29000; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1678, p. 121.

[21] Registered under No. 3998; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 277, p. 77.

[22] Registered under No. 30793; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1770, p. 27.

[23] Registered under No. 30941, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1776, p. 9. This declaration replaces that one made on 10 September 1985, registered under No. 23508. See United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1406, p. 133 which replaced that one made on 7 April 1970, registered under No. 10415; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 724, p. 63. For the original declaration made on 20 September 1919, see *Yearbook of the International Court of Justice 1968-1969* , p. 46.

[24] Registered under No. 12294: see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 857, p. 107.

[25] Registered under No. 3881, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 291, p. 3. This declaration replaces that one made on 29 April 1988, registered under No. 25909 and published in United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1502, p. 337 and which was terminated with effect on 3 September 2002.

[26] Registered under No. 3646; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 257, p. 35. This declaration replaces that of 10 December 1946; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. l, p. 45.

[27] Registered under number 41783.

[28] Registered on 24 March 2006.

[29] A declaration (with letter of transmittal to the Secretary-General of the United Nations) on the Suez Canal and the arrangements for its operation dated of 24 April 1957 was registered under No. 3821; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 265, p. 299.

[30] Registered under No. 3940; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 272, p. 225.

[31] Registered under No. 28436; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1653, p. 59.

[32] Registered under No. 4376; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 303, p. 137.

[33] Registered under No. 8232; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 565, p. 21.

[34] Registered under No. 31938; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1870.

[35] Registered under No. 30624; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1761, p. 99.

[36] Registered under No. 36940; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 2121, p. 189.

[37] Registered under No. 26756; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1543, p.39.

[38] Registered under No. 24126, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1427, p. 335. This declaration replaces that one made on 20 February 1960, received by the Secretary-General on 10 March 1960 and registered under No. 236; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 353, p. 309. For the declaration of 2 February 1948 and subsequent renewal of 19 April 1954, also registered under No. 236, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 15, p. 217, and vol. 190, p. 377.

[39] Registered under No. 29191; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1692, p. 477.

[40] Registered under No. 13546; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 15. The declaration of 14 September 1959, deposited with the Secretary-General on the same date, registered under Number 4871 and superseded by the declaration reproduced herein, is reproduced in United Nations *Treaty Series* , vol. 340, p. 289. A declaration of 7 January 1956, registered under Number 3116, is reproduced in United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 226, p. 235.

[41] Registered under No. 4517; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 312, p. 155; see also note I in chapter I.3.

[42] Registered under No. 7697; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 531, p. 113.

[43] Registered under No. 36911; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 2120, p. 467.

[44] Registered under No. 2145; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 163, p. 117.

[45] The instrument of ratification was deposited on 17 April 1953.

[46] Liechtenstein became a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice on 29 March 1950; see also note I in chapter I.3.

[47] Registered under No. 759; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 51, p. 119.

[48] Registered under 29011; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1679, p. 57.

[49] Registered under No. 8438; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 581, p. 135.

[50] The declaration of 2 September 1983 completes that one made on 6 December 1966 (registered under No. 8423 and published in United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 580, p. 205) and replaces that one communicated on 23 January 1981 (also registered under No. 8423 and published in United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1211, p. 34). A declaration of 22 November 1966 was registered on 12 December 1966 under Number 8438.

[51] Registered under No. 9251; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 646, p. 171.

[52] Registered under No. 127; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 9, p. 97.

[53] Registered under No. 3483; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 248, p. 33.

[54] The declaration of 5 August 1946 was registered under No. 2; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. l, p. 7, and vol. 248, p. 357 (Termination).

[55] Registered under No. 15931; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1055, p. 323. This declaration replaces the one of 8 April 1940, made under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice. For the text of that declaration, as well as the text of the notice of termination given on 30 March 1940 in respect of a previous declaration of 19 September 1929, see League of Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. CC, pp. 490 and 491. For the text of the declaration of 19 September 1929, see *ibid.* , vol. LXXXVIII, p. 277. For the text of a reservation formulated on 7 September 1939 in respect of the declaration of 19 September 1929, see *Permanent Court of International Justice,* Series E, No. 16, p. 342.

[56] Registered under No. 37788, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 2163, p. 73.

[57] The declaration deposited on 30 April 1998 (and registered on the same day under No. 34544; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 2013, p. 507) amends the declaration deposited on 3 September 1965 (registered under No. 7913; see United Nations *Treaty Series* , vol. 544, p. 113). In a communication received on 1 December 1998, the Government of Nigeria notified the Secretary-General of an error in its declaration of 30 April 1998 and requested that the word "only" appear after the words "the Court" and before the words "in relation to" in line 2 of paragrapah (iv).

[58] Registered under No. 32901; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1928, p. 85. This declaration amends the one made on 2 April 1976 and registered under No. 15035; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1024, p. 195. For the declaration of 19 December 1956 registered under No. 3642, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 256, p. 315.

[59] Registered under No. 5332; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 374, p. 127. This declaration replaces that of 23 May 1957 (regisered under Number 3875), in respect of which the Government of Pakistan gave notice of termination on 13 September 1960; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 269, p. 77, and vol. 374, p. 382. For the declaration of 22 June 1948 and the notice of its termination, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 16, p. 197, and vol. 257, p. 360.

[60] Registered under No. 33154, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1935, p. 305.

[61] Registered under number 39480; see United Nations, T *reaty Series* , vol. 2219, p. 303.

[62] Registered under No. 11523; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 808, p. 3. This declaration replaces that of 21 August 1947, in respect of which a notice of withdrawal was given on 23 December 1971; for the text of that declaration see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 7, p. 229.

[63] Registered under No. 32728, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1918, p. 41.This declaration replaces a previous declaration which was received on 25 September 1990 and registered under No. 27566; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1579.

[64] Registered on 25 February 2005. This declaration replaces a previous declaration dated 19 December 1955 and registered under No. 3079; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 224, p. 275.

[65] Registered under No. 23644; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1412, p. 155. This declaration replaces a previous declaration which was received on 3 May 1985 and registered on that date under No. 23354, and published in United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1397, p. 639, and which was identical in essence to the new declaration received on 2 December 1985, except that this last declaration applies only to disputes born subsequently to the said declaration.

[66] Registered under number 40363.

[67] Registered under No. 6597; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 458, p. 43.

[68] Registered under No. 27600; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1581, p.167.

[69] Registered under No. 4139; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 284, p. 215.

[70] Registered under No. 25246; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1480, p. 211.

[71] Registered under No. 9589; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 673, p. 155.

[72] Registered under No. 3794; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 264, p. 221. This declaration replaces that of 5 April 1947 registered under Number 16, which was made for a period of ten years; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 2, p. 3.

[73] Registered under No. 272; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 17, p. 115.

[74] Switzerland became a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice on 28 July 1948; upon the recommendation of the Security Council, adopted on 15 November 1946, the General Assembly by resolution 91 (I) adopted on 11 December 1946, and in pursuance of Article 93, paragraph 2, of the Charter, determined the conditions upon which Switzerland could become a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice. On 28 July 1948, a declaration accepting these conditions was deposited with the Secretary-General on behalf of Switzerland (registered under No. 271, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 17, p. 111) and accordingly on that date Switzerland became a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

[75] Registered under No. 18020; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1147, p. 189.

[76] Registered under No. 6946; see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 479, p. 35.

[77] Registered on 5 July 2004. This declaration amends the declaration of 1 January 1969 registered under No. 9370 (see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 654, p. 335) which reads as follows:

"I have the honour, by direction of Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, to declare on behalf of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland that they accept as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special convention, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the 24th of October 1945, with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the same date, other than:

"(i) any dispute which the United Kingdom

"(a) has agreed with the other Party or Parties thereto to settle by some other method of peaceful settlement; or

"(b) has already submitted to arbitration by agreement with any State which had not at the time of submission accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

"(ii) disputes with the Government of any other country which is a Member of the Commonwealth with regard to situations or facts existing before the 1st of January, 1969.

"(iii) disputes in respect of which any other Party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purpose of the dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other Party to the dispute was deposited or ratified less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court.

"2. The Government of the United Kingdom also reserve the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effects from the moment of such notification, either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations, or any that may hereafter be added.

United Kingdom Mission to the United Nations.

New York, 1 January 1969

(Signed) L. C. Glass"

The preceding declaration replaces that of 27 November 1963, registered under No. 6995, in respect of which notice of withdrawal was given on 1 January 1969; for the text of that declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 482, p. 187. For declarations preceding that of 27 November 1963, registered under Nos. 2849, 2973, 3814 and 4577, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 211, p. 109; vol. 219, p. 179; vol. 265, p. 221, and vol. 316, p 59, respectively.

[78] The Government of Luxembourg had in 1921 signed the

Optional Clause subject to ratification. That declaration was, however, never ratified.

[79] According to a telegram dated 29 November 1939, addressed to the League of Nations, Nicaragua had ratified the Protocol of Signature of the Statute of the *Permanent Court of International Justice* (16 December 1920), and the instrument of ratification was to follow. It does not appear, however, that the instrument of ratification was ever received by the League of Nations.

[80] An instrument of ratification was deposited on 14 June 1929 (in this connection, see remark in note 8).

[81] An instrument of ratification was deposited on 27 September 1921.

[82] The date (prior to 28.I.21) is the date on which this declaration (undated) was first published in a League of Nations document.

5. a) Amendments to Articles 23, 27 and 61 of the Charter of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolutions 1991 A and B (XVIII) of 17 December 1963

New York, 17 December 1963[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	31 August 1965, in accordance with article 108for all Members of the United Nations.[2]
REGISTRATION:	1 March 1966, No. 8132.
STATUS:	Parties: 107.
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 557, p. 143.

Participant[3,4]	*Ratification*
Afghanistan	25 Feb 1965
Albania	7 Dec 1964
Algeria	26 Mar 1964
Argentina	15 Mar 1966
Australia	9 Jun 1965
Austria	7 Oct 1964
Belarus	22 Jun 1965
Belgium	29 Apr 1965
Benin	17 Sep 1965
Bolivia	19 Jan 1966
Brazil	23 Dec 1964
Bulgaria	13 Jan 1965
Burkina Faso	11 Aug 1964
Burundi	23 Aug 1965
Cambodia	20 Jan 1966
Cameroon	25 Jun 1964
Canada	9 Sep 1964
Central African Republic	6 Aug 1964
Chad	2 Nov 1964
Chile	31 Aug 1965
Colombia	10 Oct 1966
Congo	7 Jul 1965
Costa Rica	7 Oct 1964
Côte d'Ivoire	2 Oct 1964
Cuba	22 Dec 1964
Cyprus	1 Sep 1965
Democratic Republic of the Congo	20 May 1966
Denmark	12 Jan 1965
Dominican Republic	4 Nov 1965
Ecuador	31 Aug 1965
Egypt	16 Dec 1964
El Salvador	1 Dec 1964
Ethiopia	22 Jul 1964
Finland	18 Jan 1965
France	24 Aug 1965
Gabon	11 Aug 1964
Ghana	4 May 1964
Greece	2 Aug 1965
Guatemala	18 Aug 1965
Guinea	19 Aug 1964
Honduras	9 Oct 1968
Hungary	23 Feb 1965
Iceland	6 Nov 1964
India	10 Sep 1964
Indonesia	30 Mar 1973
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	12 Jan 1965
Iraq	25 Nov 1964
Ireland	27 Oct 1964
Israel	13 May 1965
Italy	25 Aug 1965
Jamaica	12 Mar 1964
Japan	4 Jun 1965
Jordan	7 Aug 1964
Kenya	28 Oct 1964
Kuwait	28 Dec 1964
Lao People's Democratic Republic	20 Apr 1965
Lebanon	27 Sep 1965
Liberia	21 Sep 1964
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	27 Aug 1964
Luxembourg	22 Oct 1965
Madagascar	14 Dec 1964
Malawi	2 Jun 1965
Malaysia	26 May 1965
Mali	23 Sep 1964
Malta	23 Jun 1965
Mauritania	29 Jan 1965
Mexico	5 May 1965
Mongolia	10 Mar 1965
Morocco	9 Nov 1964
Myanmar	3 Jun 1965
Nepal	3 Dec 1964
Netherlands	14 Dec 1964

Participant[3,4]	Ratification
New Zealand	26 Aug 1964
Niger	8 Sep 1964
Nigeria	5 Dec 1964
Norway	17 Dec 1964
Pakistan	25 Mar 1965
Panama	27 Jul 1965
Paraguay	17 Aug 1965
Peru	2 Dec 1966
Philippines	9 Nov 1964
Poland	8 Jan 1965
Romania	5 Feb 1965
Russian Federation	10 Feb 1965
Rwanda	17 Nov 1964
Saudi Arabia	17 Jun 1965
Senegal	23 Apr 1965
Sierra Leone	25 Mar 1965
Somalia	6 Oct 1965
Spain	5 Aug 1965

Participant[3,4]	Ratification
Sri Lanka	13 Nov 1964
Sudan	7 May 1965
Sweden	18 Dec 1964
Syrian Arab Republic	24 Feb 1965
Thailand	23 Mar 1964
Togo	19 Aug 1964
Trinidad and Tobago	18 Aug 1964
Tunisia	29 May 1964
Turkey	1 Jul 1965
Uganda	10 Feb 1965
Ukraine	17 May 1965
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	4 Jun 1965
United Republic of Tanzania	7 Oct 1964
United States of America	31 Aug 1965
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	1 Sep 1965
Yemen[5]	7 Jul 1965
Zambia	28 Apr 1965

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighteenth Session, Supplement No. 15* (A/5515), p. 21.

[2] As depositary of the amendments to the Charter, the Secretary-General drew up a protocol of entry into force of these amendments and communicated it to all Member States.

[3] Czechoslovakia had ratified the amendments on 19 January 1965. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] Ratification on behalf of the Republic of China on 2 August 1965. See note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General, the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Czechoslovakia, Hungary and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, pointing out that in the annex to the said protocol, which contains a list of States Members of the United Nations having deposited instruments of ratification of the amendments, there is a reference to an instrument of ratification by China, stated that their Governments did not recognize any authority other than the Government of the People's Republic of China as entitled to represent and act on behalf of China and that, therefore, they considered the said instrument as having no legal force whatsoever. They noted, however, the position in this matter of the Government of the People's Republic of China, which had announced that it would not object to the introduction of the amendments to the relevant Articles of the Charter even before the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

In a note addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the communication from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics mentioned above, the Permanent Representative of the Republic of China to the United Nations stated that the Republic of China, a permanent member of the Security Council, had ratified the amendments and deposited the instrument of ratification with the Secretary-General on 2 August 1965 and that, therefore, there could be no question that the protocol of entry into force of the amendments was valid in its entirety. He further stated that the allegations made by the Soviet Union were untenable both in law and in fact and could in no way affect the validity of the protocol and the entry into force of the amendments.

[5] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

5. b) Amendment to Article 109 of the Charter of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 2101 (XX) of 20 December 1965

New York, 20 December 1965[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 12 June 1968, in accordance with article 108for all Members of the United Nations.[2]
REGISTRATION: 12 June 1968, No. 8132.
STATUS: Parties: 92.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 638, p. 308.

Participant[3,4,5]	*Ratification*
Afghanistan	16 Nov 1966
Albania	12 Oct 1966
Algeria	30 Apr 1969
Argentina	12 Apr 1967
Australia	27 Sep 1966
Austria	29 Sep 1966
Belarus	21 Sep 1966
Belgium	29 Jun 1966
Benin	29 Jun 1966
Bolivia	28 Jul 1966
Botswana	12 Jun 1968
Brazil	12 Jul 1966
Bulgaria	2 Jun 1966
Burkina Faso	18 Jul 1966
Canada	11 Jul 1966
Chile	22 Aug 1968
Côte d'Ivoire	15 Jan 1968
Cuba	17 May 1976
Cyprus	31 May 1966
Democratic Republic of the Congo	9 Jun 1966
Denmark	31 May 1967
Dominican Republic	4 May 1966
Ecuador	5 May 1966
Egypt	23 Jan 1967
Ethiopia	28 Jul 1966
Finland	11 Jan 1967
France	18 Oct 1967
Gabon	24 Dec 1968
Gambia	11 Jul 1966
Ghana	8 Sep 1966
Greece	17 Oct 1969
Guatemala	16 Jun 1966
Guyana	31 Jan 1968
Hungary	4 May 1967
Iceland	21 Jun 1966
India	11 Jul 1966
Indonesia	30 Mar 1973
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	13 Jan 1967
Iraq	12 Jan 1967
Ireland	20 Sep 1966
Israel	29 Aug 1966
Italy	4 Dec 1967
Jamaica	12 Jul 1966
Jordan	25 Mar 1966
Kenya	16 Jun 1966
Kuwait	26 Oct 1967
Lao People's Democratic Republic	21 Oct 1966
Lebanon	20 Mar 1969
Liberia	1 Jul 1969
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	3 Aug 1967
Luxembourg	12 Dec 1967
Madagascar	23 Jan 1968
Malawi	11 Apr 1966
Malaysia	28 Apr 1966
Maldives	5 Sep 1968
Malta	30 Jun 1966
Mexico	18 Apr 1967
Mongolia	17 Apr 1969
Morocco	27 Dec 1966
Myanmar	8 Jun 1967
Nepal	20 Jul 1966
Netherlands	5 Jan 1967
New Zealand	20 May 1966
Niger	28 Apr 1966
Nigeria	15 Jun 1967
Norway	29 Apr 1966
Pakistan	10 Aug 1966
Paraguay	7 Aug 1967
Philippines	2 Oct 1967
Poland	22 May 1967
Romania	12 Jan 1967
Russian Federation	22 Sep 1966

Participant[3,4,5]	*Ratification*
Rwanda	9 Sep 1966
Saudi Arabia	11 Dec 1968
Sierra Leone	24 Jan 1968
Singapore	25 Jul 1966
Spain	28 Oct 1966
Sri Lanka	24 Aug 1966
Sudan	24 Apr 1968
Sweden	15 Jul 1966
Syrian Arab Republic	8 Dec 1967
Thailand	9 Jun 1966
Togo	14 May 1968
Trinidad and Tobago	22 Apr 1966
Tunisia	23 Aug 1966
Turkey	16 Mar 1967
Uganda	15 Apr 1969
Ukraine	1 Nov 1966
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	19 Oct 1966
United Republic of Tanzania	20 Jun 1966
United States of America	31 May 1967
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	9 Nov 1967

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Supplement No. 14* (A/6014), p. 90.

[2] As depositary of the amendments to the Charter, the Secretary-General drew up a protocol of entry into force of these amendments and communicated it to all Member States.

[3] Czechoslovakia had ratified the amendment on 7 October 1966. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] Ratification on behalf of the Republic of China on 8 July 1966. See note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned ratification, the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Albania, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia stated that the only Government entitled to represent and to assume international obligations on behalf of China was the Government of the People's Republic of China and that, therefore, they did not recognize as valid the said ratification.

In a note addressed to the Secretary-General, the Permanent Mission of the Republic of China stated that the allegations contained in the above-mentioned communications are untenable both in law and in fact and could not in any way affect the requirements of Article 108 of the Charter or the validity of the amendments to the Charter duly ratified under the said Article.

[5] The former Yugoslavia had ratified the amendment on 13 March 1967. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

5. c) Amendment to Article 61 of the Charter of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 2847 (XXVI) of 20 December 1971

New York, 20 December 1971[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	24 September 1973, in accordance with article 108for all Members of the United Nations.[2]
REGISTRATION:	24 September 1973, No. 8132.
STATUS:	Parties: 106.
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 892, p. 119.

Participant[3,4]	*Ratification*
Afghanistan	20 Sep 1973
Albania	22 Mar 1974
Algeria	21 Jun 1972
Argentina	19 Mar 1973
Australia	16 Nov 1972
Austria	12 Jan 1973
Bahrain	22 Aug 1972
Barbados	12 Jun 1972
Belarus	15 Jun 1973
Belgium	26 Mar 1973
Benin	5 Feb 1973
Bhutan	13 Sep 1972
Bolivia	29 Jun 1973
Botswana	12 Feb 1973
Brazil	7 Sep 1972
Bulgaria	5 Jun 1973
Cameroon	12 Dec 1972
Canada	28 Sep 1972
Chad	11 May 1973
Chile	23 Jul 1974
China[5,6]	15 Sep 1972
Colombia	20 May 1975
Costa Rica	14 Aug 1973
Côte d'Ivoire	28 Feb 1973
Cuba	17 May 1976
Cyprus	26 Jun 1972
Democratic Republic of the Congo	16 Aug 1973
Denmark	23 Jan 1973
Dominican Republic	29 Nov 1972
Ecuador	20 Apr 1973
Egypt	28 Dec 1972
Ethiopia	27 Feb 1974
Fiji	12 Jun 1972
Finland	30 Mar 1972
France	1 Jun 1973
Ghana	8 Jan 1973
Greece	15 Jan 1974
Guatemala	3 Oct 1972
Guinea	27 Jun 1973
Guyana	22 May 1973
Hungary	12 Jul 1973
Iceland	6 Mar 1973
India	5 Jan 1973
Indonesia	30 Mar 1973
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	15 Mar 1973
Iraq	9 Aug 1972
Ireland	6 Oct 1972
Italy	25 Jul 1973
Jamaica	6 Oct 1972
Japan	15 Jun 1973
Jordan	2 Jun 1972
Kenya	5 Oct 1972
Kuwait	20 Jun 1972
Lebanon	2 Jul 1973
Lesotho	30 May 1973
Liberia	4 Dec 1972
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	12 Apr 1973
Luxembourg	5 Jun 1973
Madagascar	19 Jul 1973
Malawi	15 Sep 1972
Malaysia	16 Jun 1972
Mali	30 Aug 1973
Malta	22 Feb 1973
Mauritius	29 Jun 1973
Mexico	11 Apr 1973
Mongolia	18 May 1973
Morocco	26 Sep 1972
Nepal	24 Nov 1972
Netherlands	31 Oct 1972
New Zealand	19 Jul 1972
Nicaragua	17 Jul 1973
Niger	22 Aug 1972

Participant[3,4]	*Ratification*
Nigeria	17 Oct 1973
Norway	14 Mar 1973
Oman	23 Jun 1972
Pakistan	21 Aug 1973
Panama	26 Sep 1972
Paraguay	28 Dec 1973
Peru	26 Jun 1973
Philippines	14 Nov 1972
Poland	19 Sep 1973
Qatar	15 Jun 1972
Romania	26 Feb 1973
Russian Federation	1 Jun 1973
Rwanda	6 Nov 1973
Senegal	25 Jan 1973
Sierra Leone	15 Oct 1973
Singapore	18 Apr 1972
Spain	26 Jul 1973

Participant[3,4]	*Ratification*
Sri Lanka	6 Dec 1972
Sudan	4 Oct 1972
Sweden	22 Dec 1972
Syrian Arab Republic	21 Aug 1974
Thailand	19 Jul 1972
Togo	29 Oct 1973
Trinidad and Tobago	11 Sep 1972
Tunisia	8 Nov 1972
Uganda	12 Jun 1972
Ukraine	16 May 1973
United Arab Emirates	29 Sep 1972
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[5]	19 Jun 1973
United Republic of Tanzania	4 Apr 1973
United States of America	24 Sep 1973
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	29 Oct 1974
Yemen[7]	15 Jun 1972
Zambia	13 Oct 1972

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Supplement No. 29* (A/8429), p. 67.

[2] As depositary of the amendments to the Charter, the Secretary-General drew up a protocol of entry into force of these amendments and communicated it to all Member States.

[3] Czechoslovakia had ratified the amendments on 4 February 1972. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] The former Yugoslavia had ratified the amendment on 23 October 1972. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portugal" regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] The Yemen Arab Republic had ratified the amendment to Article 61 of the Charter on 7 July 1972. See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume. .

CHAPTER II

PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

1. REVISED GENERAL ACT FOR THE PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

New York, 28 April 1949[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	20 September 1950, in accordance with article 44.
REGISTRATION:	20 September 1950, No. 912.
STATUS:	Parties: 8.
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 71, p. 101.

Participant	*Accession(a)*	*Extension*
Belgium[2]	23 Dec 1949 a	
Burkina Faso[2]	27 Mar 1962 a	
Denmark[2]	25 Mar 1952 a	
Estonia[2]	21 Oct 1991 a	
Luxembourg[2]	28 Jun 1961 a	
Netherlands[3,4]	9 Jun 1971 a	
Norway[2]	16 Jul 1951 a	
Sweden[5]	22 Jun 1950 a	

Notes:

[1] Resolution 268 A (III), *Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Part II (A/900),* p. 10.

[2] Extending to all the provisions of the Act (chapters I, II, III, and IV).

[3] For the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 1 under "Netherlands" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] Extending to the provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (chapters I and II), together with the general provisions dealing with these procedures (chapter IV).

[5] Extending to the provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (chapters I and II), together with the general provisions dealing with these procedures (chapter IV) subject to the reservation on disputes arising out of facts prior to this accession.

CHAPTER III

PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES, DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR RELATIONS, ETC

1. Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations

New York, 13 February 1946[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 17 September 1946, in accordance with section 32.The Convention first entered into force in regard to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland by the deposit of its instrument of accession.

REGISTRATION: 14 December 1946, No. 4.

STATUS: Parties: 157.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1, p. 15, and vol. 90, p. 327 (corrigendum to vol. 1).

Participant	*Accession(a), Succession(d)*	
Afghanistan	5 Sep	1947 a
Albania	2 Jul	1957 a
Algeria	31 Oct	1963 a
Angola	9 Aug	1990 a
Antigua and Barbuda	25 Oct	1988 d
Argentina	12 Oct	1956 a
Armenia	29 Apr	2004 a
Australia	2 Mar	1949 a
Austria	10 May	1957 a
Azerbaijan	13 Aug	1992 a
Bahamas	17 Mar	1977 d
Bahrain	17 Sep	1992 a
Bangladesh	13 Jan	1978 d
Barbados	10 Jan	1972 d
Belarus	22 Oct	1953 a
Belgium	25 Sep	1948 a
Belize	14 Sep	2005 a
Bolivia	23 Dec	1949 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]	1 Sep	1993 d
Brazil	15 Dec	1949 a
Bulgaria	30 Sep	1960 a
Burkina Faso	27 Apr	1962 a
Burundi	17 Mar	1971 a
Cambodia	6 Nov	1963 a
Cameroon	20 Oct	1961 d
Canada	22 Jan	1948 a
Central African Republic	4 Sep	1962 d
Chile	15 Oct	1948 a
China[3]	11 Sep	1979 a
Colombia	6 Aug	1974 a
Congo	15 Oct	1962 d
Costa Rica	26 Oct	1949 a
Côte d'Ivoire	8 Dec	1961 d
Croatia[2]	12 Oct	1992 d
Cuba	9 Sep	1959 a
Cyprus	5 Nov	1963 d
Czech Republic[4]	22 Feb	1993 d
Democratic Republic of the Congo	8 Dec	1964 a
Denmark	10 Jun	1948 a
Djibouti	6 Apr	1978 d
Dominica	24 Nov	1987 d
Dominican Republic	7 Mar	1947 a
Ecuador	22 Mar	1956 a
Egypt	17 Sep	1948 a
El Salvador	9 Jul	1947 a
Estonia	21 Oct	1991 a
Ethiopia	22 Jul	1947 a
Fiji	21 Jun	1971 d
Finland	31 Jul	1958 a
France	18 Aug	1947 a
Gabon	13 Mar	1964 a
Gambia	1 Aug	1966 d
Georgia	17 Dec	2007 a
Germany[5,6]	5 Nov	1980 a
Ghana	5 Aug	1958 a
Greece[7]	29 Dec	1947 a
Guatemala	7 Jul	1947 a
Guinea	10 Jan	1968 a
Guyana	28 Dec	1972 a
Haiti	6 Aug	1947 a
Honduras	16 May	1947 a
Hungary	30 Jul	1956 a
Iceland	10 Mar	1948 a
India	13 May	1948 a

Participant	*Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Indonesia	8 Mar 1972 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	8 May 1947 a
Iraq	15 Sep 1949 a
Ireland	10 May 1967 a
Israel	21 Sep 1949 a
Italy	3 Feb 1958 a
Jamaica	9 Sep 1963 a
Japan	18 Apr 1963 a
Jordan	3 Jan 1958 a
Kazakhstan	26 Aug 1998 a
Kenya	1 Jul 1965 a
Kuwait	13 Dec 1963 a
Kyrgyzstan	28 Jan 2000 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic	24 Nov 1956 a
Latvia	21 Nov 1997 a
Lebanon	10 Mar 1949 a
Lesotho	26 Nov 1969 a
Liberia	14 Mar 1947 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	28 Nov 1958 a
Liechtenstein	25 Mar 1993 a
Lithuania	9 Dec 1993 a
Luxembourg	14 Feb 1949 a
Madagascar	23 May 1962 d
Malawi	17 May 1966 a
Malaysia	28 Oct 1957 d
Mali	28 Mar 1968 a
Malta	27 Jun 1968 d
Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 d
Mexico	26 Nov 1962 a
Micronesia (Federated States of)	5 Dec 2008 a
Monaco	8 Mar 2005 a
Mongolia	31 May 1962 a
Montenegro[8]	23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	18 Mar 1957 a
Mozambique	8 May 2001 a
Myanmar	25 Jan 1955 a
Namibia	17 Jul 2006 a
Nepal	28 Sep 1965 a
Netherlands	19 Apr 1948 a
New Zealand[9]	10 Dec 1947 a
Nicaragua	29 Nov 1947 a
Niger	25 Aug 1961 d
Nigeria	26 Jun 1961 d
Norway	18 Aug 1947 a
Pakistan	22 Sep 1948 a

Participant	*Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Panama	27 May 1947 a
Papua New Guinea	4 Dec 1975 d
Paraguay	2 Oct 1953 a
Peru	24 Jul 1963 a
Philippines	28 Oct 1947 a
Poland	8 Jan 1948 a
Portugal	14 Oct 1998 a
Qatar	26 Sep 2007 a
Republic of Korea	9 Apr 1992 a
Republic of Moldova	12 Apr 1995 a
Romania	5 Jul 1956 a
Russian Federation	22 Sep 1953 a
Rwanda	15 Apr 1964 a
Senegal	27 May 1963 d
Serbia[2]	12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles	26 Aug 1980 a
Sierra Leone	13 Mar 1962 d
Singapore	18 Mar 1966 d
Slovakia[4]	28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[2]	6 Jul 1992 d
Somalia	9 Jul 1963 a
South Africa	30 Aug 2002 a
Spain	31 Jul 1974 a
Sri Lanka	19 Jun 2003 a
St. Lucia	27 Aug 1986 d
Sudan	21 Mar 1977 a
Sweden	28 Aug 1947 a
Syrian Arab Republic	29 Sep 1953 a
Tajikistan	19 Oct 2001 a
Thailand	30 Mar 1956 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[2,7]	18 Aug 1993 d
Togo	27 Feb 1962 d
Trinidad and Tobago	19 Oct 1965 a
Tunisia	7 May 1957 a
Turkey	22 Aug 1950 a
Turkmenistan	23 Nov 2007 a
Uganda	9 Jul 2001 a
Ukraine	20 Nov 1953 a
United Arab Emirates	2 Jun 2003 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[3]	17 Sep 1946 a
United Republic of Tanzania	29 Oct 1962 a
United States of America	29 Apr 1970 a
Uruguay	16 Feb 1984 a

Participant	Accession(a), Succession(d)	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	21 Dec	1998 a
Viet Nam	6 Apr	1988 a
Yemen[10]	23 Jul	1963 a
Zambia	16 Jun	1975 d
Zimbabwe	13 May	1991 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon accession or succession.)

ALBANIA[11]

The People's Republic of Albania does not consider itself bound by the provisions of section 30, which provide that any difference arising out of the interpretation or application of the present Convention shall be brought before the International Court of Justice, whose opinion shall be accepted as decisive by the parties; with respect to the competence of the Court in disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention, the People's Republic of Albania will continue to maintain, as it has heretofore, that in every individual case the agreement of all the parties to the dispute is required in order that the dispute may be laid before the International Court of Justice for a ruling.

ALGERIA[11]

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by section 30 of the said Convention which provides for the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in the case of differences arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention. It declares that, for the submission of a particular dispute to the International Court of Justice for settlement, the consent of all parties to the dispute is necessary in each case. This reservation also applies to the provision of the same section that the advisory opinion given by the International Court of Justice shall be accepted as decisive.

ARMENIA

Reservation:

"The Republic of Armenia hereby declares that the paragraph c of the Section 18 of the Convention shall not apply to the nationals of the Republic of Armenia."

BAHRAIN

Declaration:

"The accession by the State of Bahrain to the said Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith."

BELARUS[11]

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provision of section 30 of the Convention which envisages the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court and, in regard to the competence of the International Court in differences arising out of the interpretation and application of the Convention, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic will, as hitherto, adhere to the position that, for the submission of a particular dispute for settlement by the International Court, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in every individual case. This reservation is equally applicable to the provisions contained in the same section, whereby the advisory opinion of the International Court shall be accepted as decisive.

BULGARIA[11,12]

CANADA

"With the reservation that exemption from taxation imposed by any law in Canada on salaries and emoluments shall not extend to a Canadian citizen residing or ordinarily resident in Canada."

CHINA[11]

The Government of the People's Republic of China has reservations on section 30, article VIII, of the Convention.

CZECH REPUBLIC[4,11]

HUNGARY[11,13]

INDONESIA[11]

"Article 1 (b) section 1: The capacity of the United Nations to acquire and dispose of immovable property shall be exercised with due regard to national laws and regulations.

"Article VIII, section 30: With regard to competence of the International Court of Justice in disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, the Government of Indonesia reserves the right to maintain that in every individual case the agreement of the parties to the dispute is required before the Court for a ruling."

LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

1. Laotian nationals domiciled or habitually resident in Laos shall not enjoy exemption from the taxation payable in Laos on salaries and income.
2. Laotian nationals who are officials of the United Nations shall not be immune from National Service obligations.

LITHUANIA[14]

Reservation:

"The Government of the Republic of Lithuania has made the reservation in respect of article 1 (1) (b), that the United Nations shall not be entitled to acquire land in the territory of the Republic of Lithuania, in view of the land regulations laid down by the article 47 of the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania."

MEXICO

(a) The United Nations and its organs shall not be entitled to acquire immovable property in Mexican territory, in view of the property regulations laid down by the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States.

(b) Officials and experts of the United Nations and its organs who are of Mexican nationality shall enjoy, in the exercise of their functions in Mexican territory, exclusively those privileges which are granted them by section 18, paragraphs *(a), (d), (f)* and *(g)* , and by section 22, paragraphs *(a), (b), (c)* , *(d)* and *(f)* respectively, of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, on the understanding that the inviolability established in the aforesaid section 22, paragraph *(c)* , shall be granted only for official papers and documents.

MONGOLIA[11,15]

NEPAL[11]

"Subject to the reservation with regard to section 18 (c) of the Convention, that United Nations officials of Nepalese nationality shall not be exempt from service obligations applicable to them pursuant to Nepalese law; and

"Subject to the reservation with regard to section 30 of the Convention, that any difference arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention to which Nepal is a party, shall be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the specific agreement of His Majesty's Government of Nepal."

PORTUGAL

Reservation:

The exemption established in paragraph (b) of section 18 shall not apply with respect to Portuguese Nationals and Residents in the Portuguese Territory which have not acquired this quality for the purpose of the exercise of their activity."

QATAR

Reservation:

.....the State of Qatar has reservation on section (30) of article (8) of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly on 13 February 1946.

The State of Qatar does not consider itself bound by the provisions of section (30) of the aforementioned Convention which provides for the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in the case of differences arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention, and declares that the consent of all the parties to the dispute is necessary for the submission of any particular dispute to the International Court of Justice for settlement.

Furthermore, the State of Qatar does not consider the advisory opinion given by the International Court of Justice shall be accepted as decisive as indicated in above-mentioned section (30).

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Reservation:

[The Government of the Republic of Korea declares] that the provision of paragraph (c) of section 18 of article V shall not apply with respect to Korean nationals.

ROMANIA[11]

The Romanian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the terms of section 30 of the Convention which provide for the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court in differences arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention; with respect to the competence of the International Court in such differences, the Romanian People's Republic takes the view that, for the purpose of the submission of any dispute whatsoever to the Court for a ruling, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in every individual case. This reservation is equally applicable to the provisions contained in the said section which stipulate that the advisory opinion of the International Court is to be accepted as decisive.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[11,16]

The Soviet Union does not consider itself bound by the provision of section 30 of the Convention which envisages the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court, and in regard to the competence of the International Court in differences arising out of the interpretation and application of the Convention, the Soviet Union will, as hitherto, adhere to the position that, for the submission of a particular dispute for settlement by the International Court, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in every individual case. This reservation is equally applicable to the provision contained in the same section, whereby the advisory opinion of the International Court shall be accepted as decisive.

SLOVAKIA[4,11]

SOUTH AFRICA

Reservations:

"The Government of the Republic of South Africa does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article II, Section 5 in so far as it relates to the buying, selling and holding of gold as certain limitations exist in the Republic regarding the buying, selling and holding of gold. Explanatory note: the buying, selling and holding of gold in the Republic is regulated. In terms of Exchange Control Regulation 2 no person other than an Authorised Dealer may buy or borrow any gold from, or sell to, any person not being an Authorised Dealer, unless exemption from Exchange Control Regulation 5 has been authorised (Mining Houses and Mining Producers may elect to sell their total gold holdings to the approved counter parties, including foreign counter parties, provided that the Exchange Control Department of the South African Reserve Bank has given the necessary exemption from the aforementioned regulation).

Pending a decision by the Government of the Republic of South Africa on the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the Government of the Republic does not consider itself bound by the terms of Article VIII, Section 30 of the Convention which provides for the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in differences arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention. The Republic will adhere to the position that, for the submission of a particular dispute for settlement by the International Court, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in every individual case. This reservation is equally applicable to the provisions contained in the said section, which stipulate that the advisory opinion of the International Court is to be accepted as decisive."

THAILAND

"Officials of the United Nations of Thai nationality shall not be immune from national service obligations".

TURKEY[17]

With the following reservations:

(a) The deferment, during service with the United Nations, of the second period of military service of Turkish nationals who occupy posts with the said Organization, will be arranged in accordance with the procedures provided in Military Law No. 1111, account being taken of their position as reserve officers or private soldiers, provided that they complete their previous military service as required under Article 6 of the above-mentioned Law, as reserve officers or private soldiers.

. . .

(e) Turkish nationals entrusted by the United Nations with a mission in Turkey as officials of the Organization are subject to the taxes payable by their fellow citizens. They must make an annual declaration of their salaries in accordance with the provisions set forth in chapter 4, section 2, of Law No. 5421 concerning income tax.

UKRAINE[11]

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provision of section 30 of the Convention which envisages the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court and, in regard to the competence of the International Court in differences arising out of the interpretation and application of the Convention, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic will, as hitherto, adhere to the position that, for the submission of a particular dispute for settlement by the International Court, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in every individual case. This reservation is equally applicable to the provision contained in the same section, whereby the advisory opinion of the International Court shall be accepted as decisive.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"(1) Paragraph (b) of section 18 regarding immunity from taxation and paragraph (c) of section 18 regarding immunity from national service obligations shall not apply with respect to United States nationals and aliens admitted for permanent residence.

"(2) Nothing in article IV, regarding the privileges and immunities of representatives of Members, in article VI, regard- ing the privileges and immunities of United Nations officials, or in article VI, regarding the privileges and immunities of experts on missions for the United Nations, shall be construed to grant any person who has abused his privileges of residence by activities in the United States outside his official capacity exemption from the laws and regulations of the United States regarding the continued residence of aliens, provided that:

"(a) No proceedings shall be instituted under such laws or regulations to require any such person to leave the United States except with the prior approval of the Secretary of State of the United States. Such approval shall be given only after consultation with the appropriate Member in the case of a representative of a Member (or member of his family) or with the Secretary-General in the case of any person referred to in articles V and VI;

"(b) A representative of the Member concerned or the Secretary-General, as the case may be, shall have the right to appear in any such proceedings on behalf of the person against whom they are instituted;

"(c) Persons who are entitled to diplomatic privileges and immunities under the Convention shall not be required to leave the United States otherwise than in accordance with the customary procedure applicable to members of diplomatic missions accredited or notifie to the United States.

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Reservations:

With regard to article I, section 1(b), of the Convention, the following reservation is made:

The acquisition of immovable property by the United Nations shall be subject to the condition set forth in the Constitution of the Republic of Venezuela and to the restrictions established by the law provided for therein.

With regard to articles V and VI of the Convention, the following reservation is made:

Venezuela hereby states that the proviso established in section 15 of article IV of this Convention shall also apply with respect to articles V and VI ejusdem.

VIET NAM[11]

1. Disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall be referred to the International Court of Justice for settlement only with the consent of all parties concerned.
2. The opinion of the International Court of Justice referred to in article VIII, section 30, shall be merely advisory and shall not be considered decisive without the consent of all parties concerned.

Notes:

[1] Resolution 22 A (I). See *Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly during the First Part of its First Session* (A/64), p. 25.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had acceded to the Convention on 30 June 1950. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 7 September 1955 with a reservation to section 30 of the Convention. The reservation was subsequently withdrawn by a notification received on 26 April 1991. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 214, p. 348. See also note 11 in this chapter and note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 4 October 1974 with a reservation. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 354. See also note 11 in this chapter and note 2 under

“Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] On 16 March 1994, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Greece the following communication:

"Accession of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations 1946 does not imply its recognition on behalf of the Hellenic Republic.

See also note 1 under “Greece” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under “Montenegro” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] In a communication received on 25 November 1960, the Govern- ment of New Zealand gave notice of the withdrawal of the reservation made upon deposit of its instrument of accession. For the text of that reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 11, p. 406. See also note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 1 under “Yemen” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[11] The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General, on the dates indicated, that it was unable to accept certain reservations made by the States listed below because in its view they were not of the kind which intending parties to the Convention have the right to make.

Date of the receipt of the objection, or date on which it was circulated by the Secretary-General:	***With respect to reservation by:***
4 August 1954*	Belarus
4 August 1954*	Ukraine
4 August 1954*	Russian Federation
1 December 1955*	Czechoslovakia
6 September 1956*	Romania
4 September 1956*	Hungary
3 October 1957*	Albania
20 June 1967*	Algeria
20 June 1967*	Bulgaria
20 June 1967*	Mongolia
20 June 1967*	Nepal
21 September 1972	Indonesia
29 November 1979	Germany
8 November 1979	China
30 January 1990	Viet Nam

* Date the objection was circulated.

[12] In a communication received on 7 August 1989, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw, with effect on that same date, the reservation in respect to Section 30 of the Convention made upon accession. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 376, p. 402.

[13] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation with respect to Section 30 of the Convention made upon accession. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 248, p. 358.

[14] Subsequently, the Government of Lithuania notified the Secretary-General of the following:

"Article 47 of the Constitution gives an exhaustive list of subjects who have the right to ownership over land plots. The provisions of article 47 of the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania and other laws of the Republic of Lithuania do not entitle international intergovernmental organizations to own the plot of land.

It is important to note that the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania and other laws of the Republic of Lithuania provide the right to the subjects, international intergovernmental organizations among others, to long-term land lease which might be up to 99 years. In accordance with procedural and administrative requirements of the national legislation, international intergovernmental organizations, for the effective performance of their obligations, may conclude agreements, acquire and dispose of necessary movable and immovable property and may institute legal proceedings.

[The Government of Lithuania] would like to emphasize that this reservation has a temporary character and in light of legal reform, changes in the current legislation are feasible."

[15] In a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation it had made upon accession. For the text of the reserva- tion, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 429, p. 246.

[16] By a communication received on 5 January 1955, the Government of Lebanon notified the Secretary-General that it objected to this reservation.

[17] By a notification received by the Secretary-General on 20 June 1957, the Government of Turkey withdrew the second, third and fourth reservations contained in its instrument of accession. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 70, p. 266.

2. CONVENTION ON THE PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

New York, 21 November 1947[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 2 December 1948, in accordance with section 44. The Convention first entered into force as regards the Netherlands by the deposit of the instrument of accession undertaking to apply the provisions of the Convention to various specialized agencies.

REGISTRATION: 16 August 1949, No. 521.

STATUS: Parties: 116.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 33, p. 261.

Note: States that are parties to the Convention are listed in the *Participant* table below. For the lists of States applying the provisions of the Convention to the respective speicalised agencies, see chapters III.2.1 to III.2.17.

Participant[2,3]	*Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Albania	15 Dec 2003 a
Algeria	25 Mar 1964 a
Antigua and Barbuda	14 Dec 1988 d
Argentina	10 Oct 1963 a
Australia	9 May 1986 a
Austria	21 Jul 1950 a
Bahamas	17 Mar 1977 d
Bahrain	17 Sep 1992 a
Barbados	19 Nov 1971 a
Belarus	18 Mar 1966 a
Belgium	14 Mar 1962 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]	1 Sep 1993 d
Botswana	5 Apr 1983 a
Brazil	22 Mar 1963 a
Bulgaria	13 Jun 1968 a
Burkina Faso	6 Apr 1962 a
Cambodia	15 Oct 1953 a
Cameroon	30 Apr 1992 a
Central African Republic	15 Oct 1962 a
Chile	21 Sep 1951 a
China[4]	11 Sep 1979 a
Côte d'Ivoire	8 Sep 1961 a
Croatia[2]	12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba	13 Sep 1972 a
Cyprus	6 May 1964 d
Czech Republic[5]	22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic Republic of the Congo	8 Dec 1964 a
Denmark	25 Jan 1950 a
Dominica	24 Jun 1988 a
Ecuador	8 Jun 1951 a
Egypt	28 Sep 1954 a
Estonia	8 Oct 1997 a
Fiji	21 Jun 1971 d
Finland	31 Jul 1958 a
France	2 Aug 2000 a
Gabon	29 Jun 1961 a
Gambia	1 Aug 1966 d
Georgia	18 Jul 2007 a
Germany[6,7,8]	10 Oct 1957 a
Ghana	9 Sep 1958 a
Greece	21 Jun 1977 a
Guatemala	30 Jun 1951 a
Guinea	1 Jul 1959 a
Guyana	13 Sep 1973 a
Haiti	16 Apr 1952 a
Hungary	2 Aug 1967 a
Iceland	17 Jan 2006 a
India	10 Feb 1949 a
Indonesia	8 Mar 1972 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 May 1974 a
Iraq	9 Jul 1954 a
Ireland	10 May 1967 a
Italy	30 Aug 1985 a
Jamaica	4 Nov 1963 a
Japan	18 Apr 1963 a
Jordan	12 Dec 1950 a
Kenya	1 Jul 1965 a
Kuwait	13 Nov 1961 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic	9 Aug 1960 a
Latvia	19 Dec 2005 a
Lesotho	26 Nov 1969 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	30 Apr 1958 a
Lithuania	10 Feb 1997 a
Luxembourg	20 Sep 1950 a
Madagascar	3 Jan 1966 a
Malawi	2 Aug 1965 a

Participant[2,3]	*Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Malaysia	29 Mar 1962 d
Maldives	26 May 1969 a
Mali	24 Jun 1968 a
Malta	27 Jun 1968 d
Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 d
Mongolia	3 Mar 1970 a
Montenegro[9]	23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	28 Apr 1958 a
Nepal[10]	23 Feb 1954 a
Netherlands	2 Dec 1948 a
New Zealand[11]	25 Nov 1960 a
Nicaragua	6 Apr 1959 a
Niger	15 May 1968 a
Nigeria	26 Jun 1961 d
Norway	25 Jan 1950 a
Pakistan	23 Jul 1951 a
Paraguay	13 Jan 2006 a
Philippines	20 Mar 1950 a
Poland	19 Jun 1969 a
Republic of Korea	13 May 1977 a
Romania	15 Sep 1970 a
Russian Federation	10 Jan 1966 a
Rwanda	15 Apr 1964 a
Senegal	2 Mar 1966 a
Serbia[2]	12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles	24 Jul 1985 a
Sierra Leone	13 Mar 1962 d
Singapore	18 Mar 1966 d
Slovakia[5]	28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[2]	6 Jul 1992 d
South Africa	30 Aug 2002 a
Spain	26 Sep 1974 a
St. Lucia	2 Sep 1986 a
Sweden	12 Sep 1951 a
Thailand	30 Mar 1956 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[2]	11 Mar 1996 d
Togo	15 Jul 1960 a
Tonga	17 Mar 1976 d
Trinidad and Tobago	19 Oct 1965 a
Tunisia	3 Dec 1957 a
Uganda	11 Aug 1983 a
Ukraine	13 Apr 1966 a
United Arab Emirates	11 Dec 2003 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[4]	16 Aug 1949 a
United Republic of Tanzania	29 Oct 1962 a
Uruguay	29 Dec 1977 a
Uzbekistan	18 Feb 1997 a
Vanuatu	2 Jan 2008 a
Zambia	16 Jun 1975 d
Zimbabwe	5 Mar 1991 a

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon accession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

BAHRAIN

"The accession by the State of Bahrain to the said Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind herewith."

BELARUS[12]

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of sections 24 and 32 of the Convention, concerning the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. Concerning the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in disputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic will maintain the same position as hitherto, namely, that for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for settlement, the agreement of all Parties involved in the dispute must be obtained in each individual case. This reservation similarly applies to the provision contained in section 32, stipulating that the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice shall be accepted as decisive.

BULGARIA[12,13]

CHINA[12]

The Government of the People's Republic of China has reservations on the provisions of section 32, article IX, of the said Convention.

CÔTE D'IVOIRE

28 December 1961

It is not possible for any Government fully to comply with the requirements of section 11 of that Convention in so far as it requires the specialized agency to enjoy in the territory of a State party to the Convention treatment not less favourable than that accorded by the Government of that State to any other Government in the matter of priorities and rates on telecommunications, unless and until all other Governments collaborate in according this treatment to the agency in question. It is understood that this matter is being discussed in the International Telecommunication Union.

CUBA[12]

The Revolutionary Government of Cuba does not consider itself bound by the provisions of sections 24 and 32 of the Convention, under which the International Court of Justice has compulsory jurisdiction in disputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention. Concerning the competence of the International Court of Justice in such disputes, Cuba takes the position that for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for settlement, the agreement of all parties involved in the dispute must be obtained in each individual case. This reservation also applies to the provision of section 32 requiring the parties concerned to accept the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice as decisive.

CZECH REPUBLIC[5,12]

FRANCE

Reservations:

Only property, funds and assets belonging to agencies, administered by them and earmarked for the functions assigned to them under the agreements by which they were established, and to which France has acceded, shall enjoy the privileges and immunities provided for in the Convention.

When an official of the agencies who does not have the same status as a member of the diplomatic staff under the Convention commits a traffic violation or causes a road accident, the privileges and immunities shall not apply.

The provisions of section 11 concerning facilities in respect of communications shall not apply to the specialized agencies.

Officials employed abroad and resident in France shall be subject to the provisions of the law applicable in France with respect to entry and stay in the national territory.

The privileges and immunities, exemptions and facilities accorded to the executive head of each agency in reference to diplomatic envoys shall not be extended to any other official, except one acting on the former's behalf during his absence from duty.

The privileges and immunities of experts sent on mission to the specialized agencies shall not exceed those accorded to officials of the specialized agencies.

France shall not be bound by the provisions of section 32 concerning the International Court of Justice, except where a prior attempt to settle the difference amicably has failed.

Interpretative declaration:

In the event of a conflict between the provisions of the Convention and the provisions of the individual agreements concluded between the specialized agencies and France, the provisions of these agreements shall have precedence.

GABON

It is not possible for any Government fully to comply with the requirements of section 11 of that Convention in so far as it requires the specialized agency to enjoy in the territory of a State party to the Convention treatment not less favourable than that accorded by the Government of that State to any other Government in the matter of priorities and rates on telecommunications, unless and until all other Governments collaborate in according this treatment to the agency in question. It is understood that this matter is being discussed in the International Telecommunication Union.

GERMANY[6,8,14]

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany takes the liberty of calling attention to the fact that the provisions of section 11 of article IV of the Convention, to the effect that the specialized agencies shall enjoy, in the territory of each State party to this Convention, for their official communications, treatment not less favourable than that accorded by the Government of such State to any other Government in the matter of priorities, rates and other taxes, cannot be fully complied with by any Government. Reference is made to the provisions of article 37 and of annex 3 of the International Telecommunication Convention concluded at Buenos Aires in 1952, as well as to the resolutions Nos. 27 and 28 appended to that Convention."

HUNGARY[12,14]

INDONESIA[12,15]

"(1) Article II (b) section 3: The capacity of the specialized agencies to acquire and dispose of immovable property shall be exercised with due regard to national laws and regulations.

"(2) Article IX section 32: With regard to the competence of the International Court of Justice in disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, the Government of Indonesia reserves the right to maintain that in every individual case the agreement of the parties to the dispute is required before the Court for a ruling."

ITALY

Declaration:

In the event that some of the specialized agencies which are mentioned in the instrument of accession and to which Italy undertakes to apply the Convention should decide to establish their headquarters or their regional offices in Italian territory, the Italian Government will be able to avail itself of the option of concluding with such agencies, in accordance with Section 39 of the Convention supplemental agreements specifying, in particular, the limits within which immunity from jurisdiction may be granted to a given agency or immunity from jurisdiction and exemption from taxation granted to officials of that agency.

LITHUANIA[16]

"... The Government of the Republic of Lithuania has made the reservation in respect of article 2 (3) (b), that the specialized agencies shall not be entitled to acquire land in the territory of the Republic of Lithuania, in view of the land regulations laid down by the Article 47 of the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania."

MADAGASCAR

The Malagasy Government will not be able to comply fully with the provisions of article IV, section 11, of the Convention, which states that the specialized agencies shall enjoy, in the territory of each State party to the Convention, for their official communications, treatment not less favourable than that accorded by the Government of such State to any other Government, in the matter of priorities, rates and taxes on telecommunications, until such time as all Governments decide to co-operate by according such treatment to the agencies in question.

MONGOLIA[12,17]

NEW ZEALAND

"The Government of New Zealand, in common with other Governments, cannot give full effect to article IV, section 11, of the Convention, which requires that the specialized agencies shall enjoy, in the territory of each State party to the Convention, for their official communications, treatment not less favourable than the treatment accorded by the Government of such a State to any other Government in the matter of priorities, rates and taxes on telecommunications, as long as all Governments have not decided to co-operate in granting this treatment to the agencies in question.

"It is noted that this matter has been receiving the consideration of the United Nations and of the International Telecommunication Union. It is also noted that the final text of the annex of the Convention approved by the International Telecommunication Union, and transmitted by the Union to the Secretary- General of the United Nations in accordance with section 36 of the Convention, contains a statement that the Union would not claim for itself the enjoyment of privileged treatment with regard to the facilities in respect of communications provided in section 11 of the Convention."

NORWAY

20 September 1951

"The Norwegian Government is of the opinion that it is impossible for any government to comply fully with Section 11 of the said Convention, which requires that the Specialized Agencies shall enjoy, in the territory of each state party to the Convention, for their official communications, treatment no less favourable than that accorded by the Government of such State to any other Government in the matter of priorities, rates and taxes on telecommunications as long as all governments have not agreed to grant to the agency in question, the treatment specified in this Section."

PAKISTAN

Declaration contained in the notification received on 15 September 1961 and also, with the second paragraph omitted, in the notifications received on 13 March 1962 and 17 July 1962:

"The enjoyment by Specialized Agencies of the communication privileges provided for in Article IV, Section 11 of the Convention cannot, in practice, be determined by unilateral action of individual Governments and has in fact been determined by the International Telecommunication Convention, Atlantic City, 1947 and Telegraph and Telephone Regulations annexed thereto, Pakistan would, therefore, not be able to comply with the provisions of Article IV, Section 11 of the Convention in view of Resolution No. 28 (annexure I) passed at the Plenipotentiary Conference of the International Telecommunication Union, held in Buenos Aires in 1952.

"The International Telecommunication Union shall not claim for itself the communication privileges provided in Article IV, Section 11 of the Convention."

POLAND[12,18]

ROMANIA[12]

The Socialist Republic of Romania states that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of sections 24 and 32, whereby the question whether an abuse of a privilege or immunity has occurred, and differences arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention and disputes between specialized agencies and Member States, shall be referred to the International Court of Justice. The position of the Socialist Republic of Romania is that such questions, differences or disputes may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the agreement of the parties in each individual case.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[12]

Declaration made upon accession and also contained in the notification received on 16 November 1972:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider it self bound by the provisions of sections 24 and 32 of the Convention, concerning the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. Concerning the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in disputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention, the USSR will maintain the same position as hitherto, namely, that for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for settlement, the agreement of all Parties involved in the dispute must be obtained in each individual case. This reservation similarly applies to the provision contained in section 32, stipulating that the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice shall be accepted as decisive.

SLOVAKIA[5,12]

SOUTH AFRICA

Reservations:

"1. The Government of the Republic of South Africa does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article III, Section 7 in so far as it relates to the buying, selling and holding of gold as certain limitations exist in the Republic regarding the buying, selling and holding of gold.

Explanatory note: the buying, selling and holding of gold in the Republic is regulated. In terms of Exchange Control Regulation 2 no person other than an Authorized Dealer may buy or borrow any gold from, or sell, to any person not being an Authorized Dealer, unless exemption from Exchange Control Regulation 5 has been authorized (Mining Houses and Mining Producers may elect to sell their total gold holdings to the approved counter parties, including foreign counter parties, provided that the Exchange Control Department of the South African Reserve Bank has given the necessary exemption from the aforementioned regulation).

2. Pending a decision by the Government of the Republic of South Africa on the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the Government of the Republic does not consider itself bound by the terms of Article IX, Section 32 of the Convention which provides for the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in differences arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention. The Republic will adhere to the position that, for the submission of a particular dispute for settlement by the International Court, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in every individual case. This reservation is equally applicable to the provisions contained in the said section, which stipulate that the advisory opinion of the International Court is to be accepted as decisive."

UKRAINE[12]

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of sections 24 and 32 of the Convention, concerning the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. Concerning the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in disputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention, the Ukrainian Soviet

Socialist Republic will maintain the same position as hitherto, namely, that for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for settlement, the agreement of all Parties involved in the dispute must be obtained in each individual case. This reservation similarly applies to the provision contained in section 32, stipulating that the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice shall be accepted as decisive.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"It is not possible for any Government fully to comply with the requirements of Section 11 of that Convention in so far as it requires the Specialized Agency to enjoy in the territory of a state party to the Convention treatment not less favourable than that accorded by the Government of that state to any other Government in the matter of priorities and rates on telecommunications, unless and until all other Governments collaborate in according this treatment to the Agency in question. It is understood that this matter is being discussed in the International Telecommunication Union."

17 December 1954

"With regard to the Universal Postal Union and the World Meteorological Organization, ... no Government can fully comply with Section 11 of this Convention which requires that the specialized agencies shall enjoy, in the territory of each State party to the Convention, for their official communications, treatment not less favourable than that accorded by the Government of such a State to any other Government in the matter of priorities, rates and taxes on telecommunications so long as all the other Governments have not decided to co-operate in granting this treatment to the agencies in question. This matter is under consideration by the United Nations and the International Telecommunication Union.

"The final text of the annex to the Convention approved by the International Telecommunication Union and transmitted by the Union to the Secretary-General of the United Nations in accordance with Section 36 of the Convention contains a statement that the Union would not claim for itself the enjoyment of privileged treatment with regard to the facilities in respect of communications provided in Section 11 of the Convention."

4 November 1959

"Her Majesty's Government observe [in connection with its notification of application to the International Maritime Organisation] that it would be impracticable for any Government fully to comply with Section 11 of the Convention which requires that the Specialized Agencies shall enjoy, in the territory of each State party to the Convention, for their official communications, treatment not less favourable than that accorded by the Government of such State to any other Government in the matter of priorities, rates and taxes on telecommunications, until such time as all the other Governments have decided to co-operate in granting this treatment to the agencies in question. This matter is under consideration by the United Nations and the International Telecommunication Union."

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon accession or succession.)

NETHERLANDS[19]

11 January 1980

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has noted the reservation made on the accession of China to the Convention on the privileges and immunities of the specialized agencies, and is of the opinion that the reservation mentioned, and similar reservations other States have made in the past or may make in the future, are incompatible with the objectives and purposes of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands does, however, not wish to raise a formal objection to these reservations made by States parties to the Convention."

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Germany	10 Oct 1957	Land Berlin
	10 Oct 1957	Saar

Notes:

[1] Resolution 179 (II); *Official Records of the Second Session of the General Assembly, Resolutions* (A/519), p. 112.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had acceeded to the Convention on 23 November 1951. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] **Final texts or revised texts of annexes transmitted to the Secretary-General by the specialized agencies concerned and dates of their receipt by the Secretary-General**

1. Annex I--International Labour Organisation (ILO) 14 Sep 1948

2. Annex II--Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) 13 Dec 1948

a) Revised text of annex II 26 May 1960

b) Second revised text of annex II 28 Dec 1965

3. Annex III--International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) 11 Aug 1948

4. Annex IV--United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) 7 Feb 1949

5. Annex V--International Monetary Fund (IMF) 9 May 1949

6. Annex VI--International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) 29 Apr 1949

7. Annex VII--World Health Organization (WHO) 2 Aug 1948

a) Revised text of annex VII 5 Jun 1950

b) Second revised text of annex VII 1 Jul 1957

c) Third revised text of annex VII 25 Jul 1958

8. Annex VIII--Universal Postal Union (UPU) 11 Jul 1949

9. Annex IX--International Telecommunication Union (ITU) 16 Jan 1951

10. Annex X--International Refugee Organization (IRO)2 4 Apr 1949

11. Annex XI--World Meteorological Organization (WMO) 29 Dec 1951

12. Annex XII--International Maritime Organization (IMO) 12 Feb 1959

a) Revised text of annex XII 9 Jul 1968

b) Second revised text of annex XII 21 Nov 2001

13. Annex XIII--International Finance Corporation (IFC) 22 Apr 1959

14. Annex XIV--International Development Association (IDA) 15 Feb 1962

15. Annex XV--World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) 19 Oct 1977

16. Annex XVI--International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) 16 Dec 1977

17. Annex XVII--United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) 15 Sep 1987

[4] See note 2 under “China” and note 2 under “United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland” regarding Hong Kong in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 29 December 1966 in respect of the following agencies: ILO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO and IMO. Subsequently, on 6 September 1988 and 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General that it applied the Convention in respect of FAO (second revised text of annex II), WIPO, and UNIDO, and IMF, IBRD, IFC and IDA, respectively. The instrument of accession also contained a reservation, subsequently withdrawn on 26 April 1991. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 586, p. 247. See also note 12 in this chapter and note 1 under “Czech Republic” and note 1 under “Slovakia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 12 in this chapter and note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[8] See note 1 under “Germany” regarding Berlin (West) in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] See note 1 under “Montenegro” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] The instrument of accession by the Government of Nepal was deposited with the Director-General of the World Health Organization, in accordance with section 42 of the Convention.

[11] See note 1 under "New Zealand" " regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[12] The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General, on the dates indicated, that it is unable to accept certain reservations made by the States listed below because in its view they are not of the kind which intending parties to the Convention have the right to make:

Date of receipt of the objection:	***With respect to reservation by:***
20 Jun 1967	Belarus
20 Jun 1967	Czecholsvakia
20 Jun 1967	Ukraine
20 Jun 1967	Russian Federation
11 Jan 1968	Hungary
12 Aug 1968	Bulgaria
2 Dec 1969	Poland
17 Aug 1970	Mongolia
30 Nov 1970	Romania
21 Sep 1972	Indonesia
1 Nov 1972	Cuba
20 Nov 1974	Germany
6 Nov 1979	China
21 Apr 1983	Hungary

[13] On 24 June 1992, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon accession. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 638, p. 266.

[14] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservations in respect of sections 24 and 32 of the Convention made upon accession. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 602, p. 300.

[15] In a communication received on 10 January 1973, the Government of Indonesia informed the Secretary-General, in reference to the reservation [concerning the capacity to acquire and dispose of immovable property] that it would grant to the Specialized Agencies the same privileges and immunities which it had granted to the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

[16] By 4 December 1998, the date on which the period specified for the notification of objections by the Specialized Agencies concerned to the reservation made by Lithuania upon accession expired, no objection had been notified to the Secretary-General. Consequently, the instrument of accession by the Government of Lithuania, including the reservation, was deposited with the Secretary General on 10 February 1997.

[17] Subsequently, in a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon accession. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 719, p. 274.

[18] On 16 October 1997, the Government of Poland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with regard to sections 24 and 32 of the Convention made upon accession. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 677, p. 430.

[19] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 28 January 1980, the Government of the Netherlands indicated that the statement concerning their wish not to raise a formal objection to these reservations

"... is intended to mean that the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands does not oppose the entry into force of the Convention between itself and the reserving states."

2. 1) Annex I - International Labour Organisation (ILO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

San Francisco, 10 July 1948

REGISTRATION: 16 August 1949, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 33, p. 290.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*
Albania	4 Oct 2007
Algeria	25 Mar 1964
Antigua and Barbuda[1]	14 Dec 1988
Argentina	10 Oct 1963
Australia	9 May 1986
Austria	21 Jul 1950
Bahamas[1]	17 Mar 1977
Bahrain	17 Sep 1992
Barbados	19 Nov 1971
Belarus	18 Mar 1966
Belgium	14 Mar 1962
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1,2]	1 Sep 1993
Botswana	5 Apr 1983
Brazil	22 Mar 1963
Bulgaria	13 Jun 1968
Burkina Faso	6 Apr 1962
Cambodia	2 Jul 2007
Cameroon	30 Apr 1992
Central African Republic	15 Oct 1962
Chile	21 Sep 1951
China	9 Nov 1984
Côte d'Ivoire	28 Dec 1961
Croatia[1,2]	12 Oct 1992
Cuba	13 Sep 1972
Cyprus	6 May 1964
Czech Republic[1,3]	22 Feb 1993
Democratic Republic of the Congo	8 Dec 1964
Denmark	25 Jan 1950
Dominica	24 Jun 1988
Ecuador	8 Jun 1951
Egypt	28 Sep 1954
Estonia	8 Oct 1997
Fiji[1]	21 Jun 1971
Finland	31 Jul 1958
France	2 Aug 2000
Gabon	30 Nov 1982
Gambia[1]	1 Aug 1966
Georgia	18 Jul 2007
Germany[4,5,6]	10 Oct 1957
Ghana	9 Sep 1958
Greece	21 Jun 1977
Guatemala	30 Jun 1951
Guinea	29 Mar 1968
Guyana	13 Sep 1973
Haiti	16 Apr 1952
Hungary	2 Aug 1967
Iceland	17 Jan 2006
India	10 Feb 1949
Indonesia	8 Mar 1972
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 May 1974
Iraq	9 Jul 1954
Ireland	10 May 1967
Italy	30 Aug 1985
Jamaica	4 Nov 1963
Japan	18 Apr 1963
Jordan	23 Aug 2007
Kenya	1 Jul 1965
Kuwait	7 Feb 1963
Lao People's Democratic Republic	9 Aug 1960
Latvia	19 Dec 2005
Lesotho	26 Nov 1969
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	30 Apr 1958
Lithuania	10 Feb 1997
Luxembourg	20 Sep 1950
Madagascar	3 Jan 1966
Malawi	2 Aug 1965
Malaysia[1]	29 Mar 1962
Mali	24 Jun 1968
Malta[1]	27 Jun 1968
Mauritius[1]	18 Jul 1969
Mongolia	3 Mar 1970
Montenegro[1,7]	23 Oct 2006
Morocco	10 Jun 1958
Nepal	11 Sep 1996

Participant	*Application*
Netherlands	2 Dec 1948
New Zealand[8]	25 Nov 1960
Nicaragua	6 Apr 1959
Niger	15 May 1968
Nigeria[1]	26 Jun 1961
Norway	25 Jan 1950
Pakistan	15 Sep 1961
Paraguay	13 Jan 2006
Philippines	20 Mar 1950
Poland	19 Jun 1969
Republic of Korea	22 Mar 2006
Romania	15 Sep 1970
Russian Federation	10 Jan 1966
Rwanda	15 Apr 1964
Senegal	2 Mar 1966
Serbia[1,2]	12 Mar 2001
Seychelles	24 Jul 1985
Sierra Leone[1]	13 Mar 1962
Singapore[1]	18 Mar 1966
Slovakia[1,3]	28 May 1993

Participant	*Application*
Slovenia[1,2]	6 Jul 1992
South Africa	30 Aug 2002
Spain	26 Sep 1974
Sweden	12 Sep 1951
Thailand	19 Jun 1961
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1,2]	11 Mar 1996
Tonga[1]	17 Mar 1976
Trinidad and Tobago	19 Oct 1965
Tunisia	3 Dec 1957
Uganda	11 Aug 1983
Ukraine	13 Apr 1966
United Arab Emirates	11 Dec 2003
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	16 Aug 1949
United Republic of Tanzania	29 Oct 1962
Uruguay	29 Dec 1977
Uzbekistan	18 Feb 1997
Vanuatu[1]	2 Jan 2008
Zambia	16 Jun 1975
Zimbabwe	5 Mar 1991

Notes:

[1] These States deposited instruments of succession to the Convention and applied the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency with effect from the date of the succession of State. See Chapter III-2.

[2] The former Yugoslavia applied the Annex as from 23 November 1951. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 29 December 1966 in respect of the following agencies: ILO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO and IMO. Subsequently, on 6 September 1988 and 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General that it applied the Convention in respect of FAO (second revised text of annex II), WIPO, and UNIDO, and IMF, IBRD, IFC and IDA, respectively. The instrument of accession also contained a reservation, subsequently withdrawn on 26 April 1991. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 586, p. 247. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. 2) Annex II - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

Washington, 29 November 1948

REGISTRATION: 16 August 1949, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 33, p. 292.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*
Algeria	25 Mar 1964
Austria	21 Jul 1950
Bahamas	17 Mar 1977
Barbados	19 Nov 1971
Belgium	14 Mar 1962
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1,2]	1 Sep 1993
Botswana	5 Apr 1983
Brazil	22 Mar 1963
Bulgaria	13 Jun 1968
Burkina Faso	6 Apr 1962
Cambodia	26 Sep 1955
Central African Republic	15 Oct 1962
Chile	21 Sep 1951
Côte d'Ivoire	28 Dec 1961
Cuba	13 Sep 1972
Cyprus	6 May 1964
Democratic Republic of the Congo	8 Dec 1964
Denmark	25 Jan 1950
Ecuador	7 Jul 1953
Egypt	28 Sep 1954
Estonia	8 Oct 1997
Fiji[2]	21 Jun 1971
Finland	31 Jul 1958
Gabon	30 Nov 1982
Gambia[2]	1 Aug 1966
Germany[3,4,5]	10 Oct 1957
Ghana	9 Sep 1958
Guatemala	30 Jun 1951
Guinea	29 Mar 1968
Guyana	13 Sep 1973
Haiti	16 Apr 1952
Hungary[6]	9 Aug 1973
India	10 Feb 1949
Indonesia	8 Mar 1972
Iraq	9 Jul 1954
Ireland	10 May 1967
Jamaica	4 Nov 1963
Japan	18 Apr 1963
Jordan	12 Dec 1950
Kenya	1 Jul 1965
Lao People's Democratic Republic	9 Aug 1960
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	30 Apr 1958
Luxembourg	20 Sep 1950
Madagascar	3 Jan 1966
Malawi	2 Aug 1965
Malaysia[2]	29 Mar 1962
Mali	24 Jun 1968
Malta[2]	27 Jun 1968
Montenegro[2,7]	23 Oct 2006
Morocco	10 Jun 1958
Nepal	28 Sep 1965
Netherlands	21 Jul 1949
New Zealand[8]	25 Nov 1960
Nicaragua	6 Apr 1959
Niger	15 May 1968
Nigeria[2]	26 Jun 1961
Norway	25 Jan 1950
Pakistan	13 Mar 1962
Philippines	20 Mar 1950
Rwanda	15 Apr 1964
Senegal	2 Mar 1966
Serbia[1,2]	12 Mar 2001
Sierra Leone[2]	13 Mar 1962
Singapore[2]	18 Mar 1966
Slovenia[1,2]	6 Jul 1992
Sweden	12 Sep 1951
Thailand	30 Mar 1956
Tonga	17 Mar 1976
Trinidad and Tobago	19 Oct 1965
Tunisia	3 Dec 1957
Uganda	11 Aug 1983
United Kingdom of Great Britain and	16 Aug 1949

Participant	Application
Northern Ireland	
United Republic of Tanzania	29 Oct 1962
Vanuatu	2 Jan 2008
Zambia[2]	16 Jun 1975

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia applied the Annex as from 23 November 1951. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] These States deposited instruments of succession to the Convention and applied the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency with effect from the date of the succession of State. See Chapter III-2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[5] See note 1 regarding Berlin (West) under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The notification of 9 August 1973 is made with the same reservations as those made upon accession.

[7] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. 2a) Revised text of Annex II - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

Rome, 20 November 1959

REGISTRATION: 2 August 1960, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 371, p. 266.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*
Argentina	10 Oct 1963
Austria	14 Feb 1962
Croatia[1,2]	12 Oct 1992
Denmark	26 Dec 1960
Ecuador	2 Aug 1960
Finland	8 Sep 1960
Germany[3,4,5]	23 May 1963
Ghana	16 Sep 1960
India	12 Apr 1963
Jordan	11 Aug 1960
Kuwait	7 Feb 1963
Montenegro[2,6]	23 Oct 2006
Netherlands	28 Jun 1965
Norway	10 Nov 1960
Serbia[1,2]	12 Mar 2001
Thailand	19 Jun 1961
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1,2]	11 Mar 1996

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia applied the Annex as from 8 April 1964. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] These States deposited instruments of succession to the Convention and applied the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency with effect from the date of the succession of State. See Chapter III-2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. 2b) Second revised text of Annex II - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

Rome, 8 December 1965

REGISTRATION: 3 March 1966, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 559, p. 348.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*
Albania	15 Dec 2003
Antigua and Barbuda[1]	14 Dec 1988
Australia	9 May 1986
Austria	22 Jul 1966
Bahrain	17 Sep 1992
Belarus	31 Mar 2006
Belgium	23 Dec 2002
Brazil	15 Jul 1966
Cameroon	30 Apr 1992
China	11 Sep 1979
Croatia[1,2]	12 Oct 1992
Czech Republic[1,3]	22 Feb 1993
Dominica	24 Jun 1988
Ecuador	26 Jul 1966
Estonia	7 Nov 2008
France	2 Aug 2000
Georgia	18 Jul 2007
Germany[4,5,6]	11 Jun 1985
Greece	21 Jun 1977
Iceland	17 Jan 2006
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 May 1974
Italy	30 Aug 1985
Kenya	3 Mar 1966
Kuwait	29 Aug 1966
Latvia	19 Dec 2005
Lesotho	26 Nov 1969
Lithuania	10 Feb 1997
Madagascar	22 Nov 1966
Malawi	16 Sep 1966
Malta	21 Oct 1968
Mauritius[1,7]	18 Jul 1969
Mongolia[8]	20 Sep 1974
Montenegro[1,9]	23 Oct 2006
Morocco	30 Nov 1966
Netherlands	9 Dec 1966
New Zealand[10]	23 May 1967
Norway	2 Aug 1966
Paraguay	13 Jan 2006
Poland	19 Jun 1969
Republic of Korea	13 May 1977
Romania	15 Sep 1970
Serbia[1,2]	12 Mar 2001
Seychelles	24 Jul 1985
Slovakia[1,3]	28 May 1993
South Africa	30 Aug 2002
Spain	26 Sep 1974
St. Lucia	2 Sep 1986
Sweden	28 Sep 1960
Thailand	21 Mar 1966
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1,2]	11 Mar 1996
Trinidad and Tobago	15 Jul 1966
Ukraine	25 Feb 1993
United Arab Emirates	11 Dec 2003
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	6 Aug 1985
Uruguay	29 Dec 1977
Vanuatu	2 Jan 2008
Zimbabwe	5 Mar 1991

Notes:

[1] These States deposited instruments of succession to the Convention and applied the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency with effect from the date of the succession of State. See Chapter III-2.

[2] The former Yugoslavia applied the Annex as from 27 February 1969. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 29 December 1966 in respect of the following agencies: ILO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO and IMO. Subsequently, on 6 September 1988 and 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General that it applied the Convention in respect of FAO (second revised text of annex II), WIPO, and UNIDO, and IMF, IBRD, IFC and IDA, respectively. The instrument of accession also contained a reservation, subsequently withdrawn on 26 April 1991. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 586, p. 247. See also note 1 under “Czech Republic” and note 1 under “Slovakia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[5] See note 1 under “Germany” regarding Berlin (West) in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] Between 12 March 1968, the date of accession to independence, and 18 July 1969, the date of the notification of succession, Mauritius applied Annex II unrevised.

[8] With the same reservation as the one made upon accession to the Convention. Subsequently, in a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon accession. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 719, p. 274.

[9] See note 1 under “Montenegro” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. 3) Annex III - International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

Geneva, 21 June 1948

REGISTRATION: 16 August 1949, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 33, p. 294.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*
Abu Dhabi	nulldate
Algeria	25 Mar 1964
Antigua and Barbuda[1]	14 Dec 1988
Argentina	10 Oct 1963
Australia	9 May 1986
Austria	21 Jul 1950
Bahamas[1]	17 Mar 1977
Bahrain	17 Sep 1992
Barbados	19 Nov 1971
Belgium	14 Mar 1962
Botswana	5 Apr 1983
Brazil	22 Mar 1963
Bulgaria	13 Jun 1968
Burkina Faso	6 Apr 1962
Cambodia	26 Sep 1955
Cameroon	30 Apr 1992
Central African Republic	15 Oct 1962
Chile	21 Sep 1951
China	11 Sep 1979
Côte d'Ivoire	28 Dec 1961
Cuba	13 Sep 1972
Cyprus	6 May 1964
Czech Republic[1,2]	22 Feb 1993
Democratic Republic of the Congo	8 Dec 1964
Denmark	25 Jan 1950
Ecuador	7 Jul 1953
Egypt	28 Sep 1954
Estonia	8 Oct 1997
Fiji[1]	21 Jun 1971
Finland	31 Jul 1958
France	2 Aug 2000
Gabon	30 Nov 1982
Gambia[1]	1 Aug 1966
Georgia	18 Jul 2007
Germany[3,4,5]	10 Oct 1957
Ghana	9 Sep 1958
Greece	21 Jun 1977
Guatemala	30 Jun 1951
Guinea	29 Mar 1968
Guyana	13 Sep 1973
Haiti	16 Apr 1952
Hungary[6]	9 Aug 1973
Iceland	17 Jan 2006
India	10 Feb 1949
Indonesia	8 Mar 1972
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 May 1974
Iraq	9 Jul 1954
Ireland	10 May 1967
Italy	30 Aug 1985
Jamaica	4 Nov 1963
Japan	18 Apr 1963
Jordan	12 Dec 1950
Kenya	1 Jul 1965
Kuwait	7 Feb 1963
Lao People's Democratic Republic	9 Aug 1960
Latvia	19 Dec 2005
Lesotho	26 Nov 1969
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	30 Apr 1958
Lithuania	10 Feb 1997
Luxembourg	20 Sep 1950
Madagascar	3 Jan 1966
Malawi	2 Aug 1965
Malaysia[1]	29 Mar 1962
Mali	24 Jun 1968
Malta[1]	27 Jun 1968
Mauritius[1]	18 Jul 1969
Morocco	28 Apr 1958
Nepal	28 Sep 1965
Netherlands	2 Dec 1948
New Zealand[7]	25 Nov 1960
Nicaragua	6 Apr 1959
Niger	15 May 1968
Nigeria[1]	26 Jun 1961
Norway	25 Jan 1950

Participant	*Application*
Pakistan	15 Sep 1961
Paraguay	13 Jan 2006
Philippines	20 Mar 1950
Poland	19 Jun 1969
Republic of Korea	13 May 1977
Romania	15 Sep 1970
Russian Federation	16 Nov 1972
Rwanda	15 Apr 1964
Senegal	2 Mar 1966
Seychelles	24 Jul 1985
Sierra Leone[1]	13 Mar 1962
Singapore[1]	18 Mar 1966
Slovakia[1,2]	28 May 1993
Slovenia	21 Oct 1998
South Africa	30 Aug 2002
Spain	26 Sep 1974
St. Lucia	2 Sep 1986
Sweden	12 Sep 1951
Thailand	30 Mar 1956
Tonga[1]	17 Mar 1976
Trinidad and Tobago	19 Oct 1965
Tunisia	3 Dec 1957
Uganda	11 Aug 1983
Ukraine	25 Feb 1993
United Arab Emirates	11 Dec 2003
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	16 Aug 1949
United Republic of Tanzania	10 Apr 1963
Uruguay	29 Dec 1977
Uzbekistan	18 Feb 1997
Vanuatu	2 Jan 2008
Zambia[1]	16 Jun 1975
Zimbabwe	5 Mar 1991

Notes:

[1] These States deposited instruments of succession to the Convention and applied the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency with effect from the date of the succession of State. See Chapter III-2.

[2] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 29 December 1966 in respect of the following agencies: ILO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO and IMO. Subsequently, on 6 September 1988 and 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General that it applied the Convention in respect of FAO (second revised text of annex II), WIPO, and UNIDO, and IMF, IBRD, IFC and IDA, respectively. The instrument of accession also contained a reservation, subsequently withdrawn on 26 April 1991. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 586, p. 247. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The notification of 9 August 1973 is made with the same reservations as those made upon accession.

[7] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. 4) Annex IV - United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

Paris, 7 February 1949

REGISTRATION: 16 August 1949, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 33, p. 296.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*
Algeria	25 Mar 1964
Antigua and Barbuda[1]	14 Dec 1988
Argentina	10 Oct 1963
Australia	9 May 1986
Austria	21 Jul 1950
Bahamas[1]	17 Mar 1977
Bahrain	17 Sep 1992
Barbados	19 Nov 1971
Belarus	18 Mar 1966
Belgium	14 Mar 1962
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1,2]	1 Sep 1993
Botswana	5 Apr 1983
Brazil	22 Mar 1963
Bulgaria	13 Jun 1968
Burkina Faso	6 Apr 1962
Cambodia	26 Sep 1955
Cameroon	30 Apr 1992
Central African Republic	15 Oct 1962
Chile	7 Jun 1961
China	11 Sep 1979
Côte d'Ivoire	28 Dec 1961
Croatia[1,2]	12 Oct 1992
Cuba	13 Sep 1972
Cyprus	6 May 1964
Czech Republic[1,3]	22 Feb 1993
Democratic Republic of the Congo	8 Dec 1964
Denmark	25 Jan 1950
Dominica	24 Jun 1988
Ecuador	7 Jul 1953
Egypt	28 Sep 1954
Estonia	8 Oct 1997
Fiji[1]	21 Jun 1971
Finland	31 Jul 1958
France	2 Aug 2000
Gabon	30 Nov 1982
Gambia[1]	1 Aug 1966
Georgia	18 Jul 2007
Germany[4,5,6]	10 Oct 1957
Ghana	9 Sep 1958
Greece	21 Jun 1977
Guatemala	30 Jun 1951
Guinea	29 Mar 1968
Guyana	13 Sep 1973
Haiti	16 Apr 1952
Hungary	2 Aug 1967
Iceland	17 Jan 2006
India	10 Feb 1949
Indonesia	8 Mar 1972
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 May 1974
Iraq	9 Jul 1954
Ireland	10 May 1967
Italy	30 Aug 1985
Jamaica	4 Nov 1963
Japan	18 Apr 1963
Jordan	12 Dec 1950
Kenya	1 Jul 1965
Kuwait	7 Feb 1963
Lao People's Democratic Republic	9 Aug 1960
Latvia	19 Dec 2005
Lesotho	26 Nov 1969
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	30 Apr 1958
Lithuania	10 Feb 1997
Luxembourg	20 Sep 1950
Madagascar	3 Jan 1966
Malawi	2 Aug 1965
Malaysia[1]	29 Mar 1962
Mali	24 Jun 1968
Malta[1]	27 Jun 1968
Mauritius[1]	18 Jul 1969
Mongolia	3 Mar 1970
Montenegro[1,7]	23 Oct 2006
Morocco	10 Jun 1958

Participant	***Application***
Nepal	28 Sep 1965
Netherlands	21 Jul 1949
New Zealand[8]	25 Nov 1960
Nicaragua	6 Apr 1959
Niger	15 May 1968
Nigeria[1]	26 Jun 1961
Norway	25 Jan 1950
Pakistan	15 Sep 1961
Paraguay	13 Jan 2006
Philippines	20 Mar 1950
Poland	19 Jun 1969
Republic of Korea	13 May 1977
Romania	15 Sep 1970
Russian Federation	10 Jan 1966
Rwanda	15 Apr 1964
Senegal	2 Mar 1966
Serbia[1,2]	12 Mar 2001
Seychelles	24 Jul 1985
Sierra Leone[1]	13 Mar 1962
Singapore[1]	18 Mar 1966
Slovakia[1,3]	28 May 1993
Slovenia[1,2]	6 Jul 1992
South Africa	30 Aug 2002
Spain	26 Sep 1974
St. Lucia	2 Sep 1986
Sweden	12 Sep 1951
Thailand	19 Jun 1961
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1,2]	11 Mar 1996
Tonga[1]	17 Mar 1976
Trinidad and Tobago	19 Oct 1965
Tunisia	3 Dec 1957
Uganda	11 Aug 1983
Ukraine	13 Apr 1966
United Arab Emirates	11 Dec 2003
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[9]	17 Jan 2002
United Republic of Tanzania	29 Oct 1962
Uruguay	29 Dec 1977
Uzbekistan	18 Feb 1997
Vanuatu	2 Jan 2008
Zambia[1]	16 Jun 1975
Zimbabwe	5 Mar 1991

Notes:

[1] These States deposited instruments of succession to the Convention and applied the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency with effect from the date of the succession of State. See Chapter III-2.

[2] The former Yugoslavia applied the Annex as from 23 November 1951. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 29 December 1966 in respect of the following agencies: ILO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO and IMO. Subsequently, on 6 September 1988 and 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General that it applied the Convention in respect of FAO (second revised text of annex II), WIPO, and UNIDO, and IMF, IBRD, IFC and IDA, respectively. The instrument of accession also contained a reservation, subsequently withdrawn on 26 April 1991. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 586, p. 247. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had applied the Convention to UNESCO as from 16 August 1949. On 13 December 1985, the Secretary-General had

received from the Government of the United Kingdom a notification to the effect that it, having withdrawn from UNESCO, would withhold from UNESCO the benefits of the said Convention with effect from 13 March 1986.

2. 5) Annex V - International Monetary Fund (IMF) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

Washington, 11 April 1949

REGISTRATION: 16 August 1949, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 33, p. 298.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*
Albania	15 Dec 2003
Algeria	25 Mar 1964
Argentina	10 Oct 1963
Australia	9 May 1986
Austria	21 Jul 1950
Bahrain	17 Sep 1992
Barbados	19 Nov 1971
Belarus	27 Aug 1992
Belgium	14 Mar 1962
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1,2]	1 Sep 1993
Botswana	5 Apr 1983
Brazil	22 Mar 1963
Bulgaria	24 Jan 2000
Burkina Faso	6 Apr 1962
Cameroon	30 Apr 1992
Chile	21 Sep 1951
China	30 Jun 1981
Côte d'Ivoire	4 Jun 1962
Croatia[1,2]	12 Oct 1992
Czech Republic[2,3]	22 Feb 1993
Democratic Republic of the Congo	8 Dec 1964
Denmark	25 Jan 1950
Dominica	24 Jun 1988
Ecuador	7 Jul 1953
Egypt	28 Sep 1954
Estonia	8 Oct 1997
Finland	31 Jul 1958
France	2 Aug 2000
Gabon	30 Nov 1982
Gambia[2]	1 Aug 1966
Georgia	18 Jul 2007
Germany[4,5,6]	10 Oct 1957
Ghana	9 Sep 1958
Greece	21 Jun 1977
Guatemala	30 Jun 1951
Guinea	29 Mar 1968
Guyana	13 Sep 1973
Haiti	16 Apr 1952
Hungary[7]	19 Aug 1982
Iceland	17 Jan 2006
India	19 Oct 1949
Indonesia	8 Mar 1972
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 May 1974
Iraq	9 Jul 1954
Ireland	10 May 1967
Italy	30 Aug 1985
Japan	18 Apr 1963
Kenya	1 Jul 1965
Kuwait	7 Feb 1963
Lao People's Democratic Republic	9 Aug 1960
Latvia	19 Dec 2005
Lesotho	26 Nov 1969
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	30 Apr 1958
Lithuania	10 Feb 1997
Luxembourg	20 Sep 1950
Madagascar	3 Jan 1966
Malawi	2 Aug 1965
Mali	24 Jun 1968
Malta	13 Feb 1969
Montenegro[2,8]	23 Oct 2006
Morocco	3 Nov 1976
Nepal	28 Sep 1965
Netherlands	21 Jul 1949
Nicaragua	6 Apr 1959
Niger	15 May 1968
Norway	25 Jan 1950
Pakistan	7 Nov 1951
Paraguay	13 Jan 2006
Philippines	20 Mar 1950
Poland	11 Jun 1990
Republic of Korea	13 May 1977
Romania	23 Aug 1974
Russian Federation	29 Jun 1994
Rwanda	23 Jun 1964

Participant	*Application*
Senegal	2 Mar 1966
Serbia[1,2]	12 Mar 2001
Seychelles	24 Jul 1985
Slovakia[2,3]	28 May 1993
Slovenia[1,2]	6 Jul 1992
South Africa	30 Aug 2002
Spain	26 Sep 1974
St. Lucia	2 Sep 1986
Sweden	12 Sep 1951
Thailand	19 Jun 1961
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1,2]	11 Mar 1996
Trinidad and Tobago	19 Oct 1965
Tunisia	3 Dec 1957
Uganda	11 Aug 1983
Ukraine	25 Feb 1993
United Arab Emirates	11 Dec 2003
United Republic of Tanzania	10 Apr 1963
Uruguay	29 Dec 1977
Uzbekistan	18 Feb 1997
Vanuatu	2 Jan 2008
Zimbabwe	5 Mar 1991

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia applied the Annex as from 23 November 1951. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] These States deposited instruments of succession to the Convention and applied the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency with effect from the date of the succession of State. See Chapter III-2.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 29 December 1966 in respect of the following agencies: ILO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO and IMO. Subsequently, on 6 September 1988 and 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General that it applied the Convention in respect of FAO (second revised text of annex II), WIPO, and UNIDO, and IMF, IBRD, IFC and IDA, respectively. The instrument of accession also contained a reservation, subsequently withdrawn on 26 April 1991. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 586, p. 247. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] The notification 19 August 1982 was made with the same reservations as those made upon accession.

[8] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. 6) Annex VI - International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

Washington, 19 April 1949

REGISTRATION: 16 August 1949, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 33, p. 300.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*
Albania	15 Dec 2003
Algeria	25 Mar 1964
Argentina	10 Oct 1963
Australia	9 May 1986
Austria	21 Jul 1950
Bahrain	17 Sep 1992
Belgium	14 Mar 1962
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1,2]	1 Sep 1993
Botswana	5 Apr 1983
Brazil	24 Apr 1963
Bulgaria	24 Jan 2000
Burkina Faso	6 Apr 1962
Cameroon	30 Apr 1992
Chile	21 Sep 1951
China	30 Jun 1981
Côte d'Ivoire	4 Jun 1962
Croatia[1,2]	12 Oct 1992
Czech Republic[2,3]	22 Feb 1993
Democratic Republic of the Congo	8 Dec 1964
Denmark	25 Jan 1950
Ecuador	7 Jul 1953
Egypt	28 Sep 1954
Estonia	8 Oct 1997
Finland	31 Jul 1958
France	2 Aug 2000
Gabon	30 Nov 1982
Gambia	1 Aug 1966
Georgia	18 Jul 2007
Germany[4,5,6]	10 Oct 1957
Ghana	9 Sep 1958
Greece	21 Jun 1977
Guatemala	30 Jun 1951
Guinea	29 Mar 1968
Guyana	13 Sep 1973
Haiti	16 Apr 1952
Hungary[7]	19 Aug 1982
Iceland	17 Jan 2006
India	19 Oct 1949
Indonesia	8 Mar 1972
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 May 1974
Iraq	9 Jul 1954
Ireland	10 May 1967
Italy	30 Aug 1985
Japan	18 Apr 1963
Kenya	1 Jul 1965
Kuwait	7 Feb 1963
Lao People's Democratic Republic	9 Aug 1960
Latvia	19 Dec 2005
Lesotho	26 Nov 1969
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	30 Apr 1958
Lithuania	10 Feb 1997
Luxembourg	20 Sep 1950
Madagascar	3 Jan 1966
Malawi	2 Aug 1965
Mali	24 Jun 1968
Malta[2]	27 Jun 1968
Montenegro[2,8]	23 Oct 2006
Morocco	3 Nov 1976
Nepal	28 Sep 1965
Netherlands	21 Jul 1949
Nicaragua	6 Apr 1959
Niger	15 May 1968
Norway	25 Jan 1950
Pakistan	23 Jul 1951
Paraguay	13 Jan 2006
Philippines	20 Mar 1950
Poland	11 Jun 1990
Republic of Korea	13 May 1977
Romania	23 Aug 1974
Russian Federation	29 Jun 1994
Rwanda	23 Jun 1964
Senegal	2 Mar 1966

Participant	*Application*
Serbia[1,2]	12 Mar 2001
Seychelles	24 Jul 1985
Slovakia[2,3]	28 May 1993
Slovenia[1,2]	6 Jul 1992
South Africa	30 Aug 2002
Spain	26 Sep 1974
St. Lucia	2 Sep 1986
Sweden	12 Sep 1951
Thailand	19 Jun 1961
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1,2]	11 Mar 1996
Trinidad and Tobago	19 Oct 1965
Tunisia	3 Dec 1957
Uganda	11 Aug 1983
Ukraine	25 Feb 1993
United Arab Emirates	11 Dec 2003
United Republic of Tanzania	10 Apr 1963
Uruguay	29 Dec 1977
Uzbekistan	18 Feb 1997
Vanuatu	2 Jan 2008
Zimbabwe	5 Mar 1991

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia applied the Annex as from 23 November 1951. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] These States deposited instruments of succession to the Convention and applied the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency with effect from the date of the succession of State. See Chapter III-2.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 29 December 1966 in respect of the following agencies: ILO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO and IMO. Subsequently, on 6 September 1988 and 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General that it applied the Convention in respect of FAO (second revised text of annex II), WIPO, and UNIDO, and IMF, IBRD, IFC and IDA, respectively. The instrument of accession also contained a reservation, subsequently withdrawn on 26 April 1991. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 586, p. 247. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] The notification of 19 August 1982 was made with the same reservations as those made upon accession.

[8] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. 7) Annex VII - World Health Organization (WHO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

Geneva, 17 July 1948

REGISTRATION: 16 August 1949, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 33, p. 33.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*
Algeria	25 Mar 1964
Austria	21 Jul 1950
Barbados	19 Nov 1971
Belarus	13 Oct 1992
Belgium	14 Mar 1962
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1,2]	1 Sep 1993
Botswana	5 Apr 1983
Brazil	22 Mar 1963
Bulgaria	13 Jun 1968
Burkina Faso	6 Apr 1962
Cambodia	26 Sep 1955
Central African Republic	15 Oct 1962
Chile	21 Sep 1951
Côte d'Ivoire	8 Sep 1961
Cuba	13 Sep 1972
Cyprus	6 May 1964
Czech Republic[2,3]	22 Feb 1993
Democratic Republic of the Congo	8 Dec 1964
Denmark	25 Jan 1950
Ecuador	7 Jul 1953
Egypt	28 Sep 1954
Estonia	8 Oct 1997
Finland	31 Jul 1958
Gabon	30 Nov 1982
Gambia[2]	1 Aug 1966
Germany[4,5,6]	10 Oct 1957
Guatemala	30 Jun 1951
Guinea	29 Mar 1968
Guyana	13 Sep 1973
Haiti	16 Apr 1952
Hungary	2 Aug 1967
India	10 Feb 1949
Indonesia	8 Mar 1972
Iraq	9 Jul 1954
Ireland	10 May 1967
Jamaica	4 Nov 1963
Japan	18 Apr 1963
Jordan	12 Dec 1950
Kenya	1 Jul 1965
Lao People's Democratic Republic	9 Aug 1960
Luxembourg	20 Sep 1950
Madagascar	3 Jan 1966
Malawi	2 Aug 1965
Maldives	26 May 1969
Mali	24 Jun 1968
Malta[2]	27 Jun 1968
Mongolia	3 Mar 1970
Montenegro[2,7]	23 Oct 2006
Morocco	10 Jun 1958
Nepal[8]	23 Feb 1954
Netherlands	2 Dec 1948
New Zealand[9]	25 Nov 1960
Nicaragua	6 Apr 1959
Niger	15 May 1968
Norway	25 Jan 1950
Pakistan	15 Sep 1961
Philippines	20 Mar 1950
Russian Federation	10 Jan 1966
Rwanda	15 Apr 1964
Senegal	2 Mar 1966
Serbia[1,2]	12 Mar 2001
Singapore[2]	18 Mar 1966
Slovakia[2,3]	28 May 1993
Slovenia[1,2]	6 Jul 1992
Sweden	12 Sep 1951
Trinidad and Tobago	19 Oct 1965
Tunisia	3 Dec 1957
Uganda	11 Aug 1983
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	16 Aug 1949
United Republic of Tanzania	29 Oct 1962

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia applied the Annex as from 23 November 1951. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] These States deposited instruments of succession to the Convention and applied the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency with effect from the date of the succession of State. See Chapter III-2.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 29 December 1966 in respect of the following agencies: ILO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO and IMO. Subsequently, on 6 September 1988 and 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General that it applied the Convention in respect of FAO (second revised text of annex II), WIPO, and UNIDO, and IMF, IBRD, IFC and IDA, respectively. The instrument of accession also contained a reservation, subsequently withdrawn on 26 April 1991. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 586, p. 247. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] The instrument of accession by the Government of Nepal was deposited with the Director-General of the World Health Organization, in accordance with section 42 of the Convention.

[9] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. 7a) Revised text of Annex VII - World Health Organization (WHO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

Geneva, 26 May 1950

REGISTRATION: 14 September 1950, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 71, p. 318.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*
Austria	21 Jan 1955
Denmark	22 May 1951
India	3 Jun 1955
Malaysia[1]	29 Mar 1962
Mongolia	3 Mar 1970
Netherlands	15 Feb 1951
Norway	14 Sep 1950
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	22 Sep 1955

Notes:

[1] These States deposited instruments of succession to the Convention and applied the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency with effect from the date of the succession of State. See Chapter III-2.

2. 7b) Second revised text of Annex VII - World Health Organization (WHO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

Geneva, 27 May 1957

REGISTRATION: 22 August 1957, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 275, p. 298.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*
Austria	1 Nov 1957
Bahamas[1]	17 Mar 1977
Croatia[1,2]	12 Oct 1992
Denmark	14 Oct 1957
Egypt	3 Feb 1958
Fiji[1]	21 Jun 1971
Germany[3,4,5]	5 Sep 1958
Ghana	9 Sep 1958
India	31 Jul 1958
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	30 Apr 1958
Montenegro[1,6]	23 Oct 2006
Nigeria[1]	26 Jun 1961
Norway	11 Sep 1957
Serbia[1,2]	12 Mar 2001
Sierra Leone[1]	13 Mar 1962
Sweden	22 Aug 1957
Thailand	19 Jun 1961
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1,2]	11 Mar 1996
Tonga[1]	17 Mar 1976
Tunisia	19 May 1958
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	30 Sep 1957
Zambia[1]	16 Jun 1975

Notes:

[1] These States deposited instruments of succession to the Convention and applied the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency with effect from the date of the succession of State. See Chapter III-2.

[2] The former Yugoslavia applied the Annex as from 16 March 1959. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. 7c) Third revised text of Annex VII - World Health Organization (WHO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

Minneapolis, 17 July 1958

REGISTRATION: 27 October 1958, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 314, p. 308.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*
Albania	15 Dec 2003
Antigua and Barbuda[1]	14 Dec 1988
Argentina	10 Oct 1963
Australia	9 May 1986
Austria	28 Oct 1958
Bahrain	17 Mar 1977
Belgium	23 Dec 2002
Cameroon	30 Apr 1992
China	11 Sep 1979
Croatia[1,2]	12 Oct 1992
Denmark[3]	8 Jan 1959
Dominica	24 Jun 1988
Estonia	7 Nov 2008
Finland	2 Dec 1958
France	2 Aug 2000
Georgia	18 Jul 2007
Germany[4,5,6]	11 Feb 1959
Ghana	27 Oct 1958
Greece	21 Jun 1977
Iceland	17 Jan 2006
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 May 1974
Italy	30 Aug 1985
Kuwait	7 Feb 1963
Latvia	19 Dec 2005
Lesotho	26 Nov 1969
Lithuania	10 Feb 1998
Malaysia[1]	29 Mar 1962
Malta	21 Oct 1968
Mauritius[1]	18 Jul 1969
Montenegro[1,3]	23 Oct 2006
Netherlands	18 Mar 1965
Paraguay	13 Jan 2006
Philippines	12 Mar 1959
Poland	19 Jun 1969
Republic of Korea	13 May 1977
Romania	15 Sep 1970
Serbia[1,2]	12 Mar 2001
Seychelles	24 Jul 1985
South Africa	30 Aug 2002
Spain	26 Sep 1974
St. Lucia	2 Sep 1986
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1,2]	11 Mar 1996
Togo	15 Jul 1960
Ukraine	25 Feb 1993
United Arab Emirates	11 Dec 2003
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	6 Aug 1985
Uruguay	29 Dec 1977
Uzbekistan	18 Feb 1997
Vanuatu	2 Jan 2008
Zimbabwe	5 Mar 1991

Notes:

[1] These States deposited instruments of succession to the Convention and applied the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency with effect from the date of the succession of State. See Chapter III-2.

[2] The former Yugoslavia applied the Annex as from 14 April 1960. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the

Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. 8) Annex VIII - Universal Postal Union (UPU) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

Geneva, 25 May 1949

REGISTRATION: 16 August 1949, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 33, p. 302.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*	
Algeria	25 Mar	1964
Antigua and Barbuda[1]	14 Dec	1988
Argentina	10 Oct	1963
Australia	9 May	1986
Austria	21 Jul	1950
Bahamas[1]	17 Mar	1977
Barbados	19 Nov	1971
Belarus	18 Mar	1966
Belgium	14 Mar	1962
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1,2]	1 Sep	1993
Botswana	5 Apr	1983
Brazil	22 Mar	1963
Bulgaria	13 Jun	1968
Burkina Faso	6 Apr	1962
Cambodia	15 Oct	1953
Cameroon	30 Apr	1992
Chile	21 Sep	1951
China	11 Sep	1979
Côte d'Ivoire	28 Dec	1961
Croatia[1,2]	12 Oct	1992
Cuba	13 Sep	1972
Cyprus	6 May	1964
Czech Republic[1,3]	22 Feb	1993
Democratic Republic of the Congo	8 Dec	1964
Denmark	25 Jan	1950
Dominica	24 Jun	1988
Ecuador	12 Dec	1958
Egypt	28 Sep	1954
Estonia	8 Oct	1997
Fiji[1]	21 Jun	1971
Finland	31 Jul	1958
France	2 Aug	2000
Gabon	30 Nov	1982
Gambia[1]	8 Jan	1966
Georgia	18 Jul	2007
Germany[4,5,6]	19 May	1958
Ghana	9 Sep	1958

Participant	*Application*	
Greece	21 Jun	1977
Guatemala	30 Jun	1951
Guinea	29 Mar	1968
Guyana	13 Sep	1973
Haiti	16 Apr	1952
Hungary	2 Aug	1967
Iceland	17 Jan	2006
India	19 Oct	1949
Indonesia	8 Mar	1972
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 May	1974
Iraq	9 Jul	1954
Ireland	10 May	1967
Italy	30 Aug	1985
Jamaica	4 Nov	1963
Japan	18 Apr	1963
Jordan	12 Dec	1950
Kenya	1 Jul	1965
Kuwait	7 Feb	1963
Lao People's Democratic Republic	9 Aug	1960
Latvia	19 Dec	2005
Lesotho	26 Nov	1969
Lithuania	10 Feb	1997
Luxembourg	20 Sep	1950
Madagascar	3 Jan	1966
Malawi	2 Aug	1965
Malaysia[1]	29 Mar	1962
Maldives	26 May	1969
Mali	24 Jun	1968
Malta[1]	27 Jun	1968
Mauritius[1]	18 Jul	1969
Mongolia	3 Mar	1970
Montenegro[1,7]	23 Oct	2006
Morocco	13 Aug	1958
Nepal	28 Sep	1965
Netherlands	14 May	1952
New Zealand[8]	25 Nov	1960
Nicaragua	6 Apr	1959

Participant	Application
Niger	15 May 1968
Nigeria[1]	26 Jun 1961
Norway	25 Jan 1950
Pakistan	15 Sep 1961
Paraguay	13 Jan 2006
Poland	19 Jun 1969
Republic of Korea	13 May 1977
Romania	15 Sep 1970
Russian Federation	10 Jan 1966
Rwanda	15 Apr 1964
Senegal	2 Mar 1966
Serbia[1,2]	12 Mar 2001
Seychelles	24 Jul 1985
Sierra Leone[1]	13 Mar 1962
Singapore[1]	18 Mar 1966
Slovakia[1,3]	28 May 1993
Slovenia[1,2]	6 Jul 1992
South Africa	30 Aug 2002
Spain	26 Sep 1974

Participant	Application
St. Lucia	2 Sep 1986
Sweden	12 Sep 1951
Thailand	28 Apr 1965
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1,2]	11 Mar 1996
Togo	16 Sep 1975
Tonga[1]	17 Mar 1976
Trinidad and Tobago	19 Oct 1965
Tunisia	3 Dec 1957
Uganda	11 Aug 1983
Ukraine	13 Apr 1966
United Arab Emirates	11 Dec 2003
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	17 Dec 1954
Uruguay	29 Dec 1977
Uzbekistan	18 Feb 1997
Vanuatu	2 Jan 2008
Zambia[1]	16 Jun 1975
Zimbabwe	5 Mar 1991

Notes:

[1] These States deposited instruments of succession to the Convention and applied the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency with effect from the date of the succession of State. See Chapter III-2.

[2] The former Yugoslavia applied the Annex as from 23 November 1951. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 29 December 1966 in respect of the following agencies: ILO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO and IMO. Subsequently, on 6 September 1988 and 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General that it applied the Convention in respect of FAO (second revised text of annex II), WIPO, and UNIDO, and IMF, IBRD, IFC and IDA, respectively. The instrument of accession also contained a reservation, subsequently withdrawn on 26 April 1991. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 586, p. 247. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. 9) Annex IX - International Telecommunication Union (ITU) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

Geneva, 6 October 1950

REGISTRATION: 16 January 1951, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 79, p. 326.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*
Algeria	25 Mar 1964
Antigua and Barbuda[1]	14 Dec 1988
Argentina	10 Oct 1963
Australia	9 May 1986
Austria	28 Mar 1951
Bahamas[1]	17 Mar 1977
Barbados	19 Nov 1971
Belarus	18 Mar 1966
Belgium	14 Mar 1962
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1,2]	1 Sep 1993
Botswana	5 Apr 1983
Brazil	22 Mar 1963
Bulgaria	13 Jun 1968
Burkina Faso	6 Apr 1962
Cambodia	26 Sep 1955
Cameroon	30 Apr 1992
Chile	21 Sep 1951
China	11 Sep 1979
Côte d'Ivoire	28 Dec 1961
Croatia[1,2]	12 Oct 1992
Cuba	13 Sep 1972
Cyprus	6 May 1964
Czech Republic[1,3]	22 Feb 1993
Democratic Republic of the Congo	8 Dec 1964
Denmark	19 Jul 1951
Ecuador	7 Jul 1953
Estonia	8 Oct 1997
Fiji[1]	21 Jun 1971
Finland	31 Jul 1958
France	2 Aug 2000
Gabon	29 Jun 1961
Gambia[1]	1 Aug 1966
Georgia	18 Jul 2007
Germany[4,5,6]	10 Oct 1957
Ghana	9 Sep 1958
Greece	21 Jun 1977
Guatemala	30 Jun 1951
Guinea	29 Mar 1968
Guyana	13 Sep 1973
Haiti	16 Apr 1952
Hungary	2 Aug 1967
Iceland	17 Jan 2006
India	3 Jun 1955
Indonesia	8 Mar 1972
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 May 1974
Iraq	9 Jul 1954
Ireland	10 May 1967
Italy	30 Aug 1985
Jamaica	4 Nov 1963
Japan	18 Apr 1963
Jordan	24 Mar 1951
Kenya	1 Jul 1965
Kuwait	13 Nov 1961
Lao People's Democratic Republic	9 Aug 1960
Latvia	19 Dec 2005
Lesotho	26 Nov 1969
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	30 Apr 1958
Lithuania	10 Feb 1997
Luxembourg	27 Mar 1951
Madagascar	3 Jan 1966
Malawi	2 Aug 1965
Malaysia[1]	29 Mar 1962
Maldives	26 May 1969
Mali	24 Jun 1968
Malta[1]	27 Jun 1968
Mauritius[1]	18 Jul 1969
Mongolia	3 Mar 1970
Montenegro[1,7]	23 Oct 2006
Morocco	10 Jun 1958
Nepal	28 Sep 1965
Netherlands	15 Jun 1951
New Zealand[8]	25 Nov 1960
Nicaragua	6 Apr 1959
Niger	15 May 1968

Participant	*Application*
Nigeria[1]	26 Jun 1961
Norway	20 Sep 1951
Pakistan	15 Sep 1961
Paraguay	13 Jan 2006
Poland	19 Jun 1969
Republic of Korea	13 May 1977
Romania	15 Sep 1970
Russian Federation	10 Jan 1966
Rwanda	15 Apr 1964
Senegal	2 Mar 1966
Serbia[1,2]	12 Mar 2001
Seychelles	24 Jul 1985
Sierra Leone[1]	13 Mar 1962
Singapore[1]	18 Mar 1966
Slovakia[1,3]	28 May 1993
Slovenia[1,2]	6 Jul 1992
South Africa	30 Aug 2002
Spain	26 Sep 1974

Participant	*Application*
St. Lucia	2 Sep 1986
Sweden	12 Sep 1951
Thailand	19 Jun 1961
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1,2]	11 Mar 1996
Tonga[1]	17 Mar 1976
Trinidad and Tobago	19 Oct 1965
Tunisia	3 Dec 1957
Uganda	11 Aug 1983
Ukraine	13 Apr 1966
United Arab Emirates	11 Dec 2003
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	17 Dec 1954
United Republic of Tanzania	10 Apr 1963
Uruguay	29 Dec 1977
Uzbekistan	18 Feb 1997
Vanuatu	2 Jan 2008
Zambia[1]	16 Jun 1975
Zimbabwe	5 Mar 1991

Notes:

[1] These States deposited instruments of succession to the Convention and applied the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency with effect from the date of the succession of State. See Chapter III-2.

[2] The former Yugoslavia applied the Annex as from 23 November 1951. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 29 December 1966 in respect of the following agencies: ILO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO and IMO. Subsequently, on 6 September 1988 and 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General that it applied the Convention in respect of FAO (second revised text of annex II), WIPO, and UNIDO, and IMF, IBRD, IFC and IDA, respectively. The instrument of accession also contained a reservation, subsequently withdrawn on 26 April 1991. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 586, p. 247. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. 10) Annex X - International Refugee Organization (IRO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies*

Geneva, 29 March 1949

REGISTRATION:	16 August 1949, No. 521.
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 33, p. 302.
TERMINATION:	The IRO terminated its work in 1952. See the note below.

Note: The International Refugee Organization (IRO) was established in 1946 as a temporary specialized agency of the United Nations. In arranging for the care and the repatriation or resettlement of Europeans made homeless by World War II, the organization brought to a conclusion part of the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. IRO was dissolved by Resolution No. 108, adopted by the General Council of the IRO at its 101st meeting on 15 February 1952. It terminated its work in 1952, having resettled circa 1,000,000 persons. It was superseded by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

---

2. 11) Annex XI - World Meteorological Organization (WMO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

Paris, 17 April 1951

REGISTRATION: 29 December 1951, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 117, p. 386.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*
Algeria	25 Mar 1964
Antigua and Barbuda[1]	14 Dec 1988
Argentina	10 Oct 1963
Australia	9 May 1986
Austria	21 Jan 1955
Bahamas[1]	17 Mar 1977
Barbados	19 Nov 1971
Belarus	18 Mar 1966
Belgium	14 Mar 1962
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1,2]	1 Sep 1993
Brazil	22 Mar 1963
Bulgaria	13 Jun 1968
Burkina Faso	6 Apr 1962
Cambodia	26 Sep 1955
Cameroon	30 Apr 1992
Central African Republic	15 Oct 1962
China	11 Sep 1979
Côte d'Ivoire	26 Sep 1962
Croatia[1,2]	12 Oct 1992
Cuba	13 Sep 1972
Cyprus	6 May 1964
Czech Republic[1,3]	22 Feb 1993
Democratic Republic of the Congo	8 Dec 1964
Denmark	10 Mar 1953
Dominica	24 Jun 1988
Ecuador	14 Jul 1954
Egypt	1 Jun 1955
Estonia	8 Oct 1997
Fiji[1]	21 Jun 1971
Finland	31 Jul 1958
France	2 Aug 2000
Gabon	30 Nov 1982
Gambia[1]	1 Aug 1966
Georgia	18 Jul 2007
Germany[4,5,6]	10 Oct 1957
Ghana	9 Sep 1958
Greece	21 Jun 1977
Guatemala	4 Oct 1954
Guinea	1 Jul 1959
Guyana	13 Sep 1973
Haiti	16 Apr 1952
Hungary	2 Aug 1967
Iceland	17 Jan 2006
India	9 Mar 1955
Indonesia	8 Mar 1972
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 May 1974
Iraq	9 Jul 1954
Ireland	10 May 1967
Italy	30 Aug 1985
Jamaica	4 Nov 1963
Japan	18 Apr 1963
Jordan	10 Dec 1957
Kenya	1 Jul 1965
Kuwait	7 Feb 1963
Lao People's Democratic Republic	9 Aug 1960
Latvia	19 Dec 2005
Lesotho	26 Nov 1969
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	30 Apr 1958
Lithuania	10 Feb 1997
Luxembourg	22 Aug 1952
Madagascar	3 Jan 1966
Malawi	2 Aug 1965
Malaysia[1]	29 Mar 1962
Mali	24 Jun 1968
Malta[1]	27 Jun 1968
Mauritius[1]	18 Jul 1969
Mongolia	3 Mar 1970
Montenegro[1,7]	23 Oct 2006
Morocco	28 Apr 1958
Netherlands	5 Jan 1954
New Zealand[8]	25 Nov 1960
Nicaragua	6 Apr 1959
Niger	15 May 1968
Nigeria[1]	26 Jun 1961

Participant	*Application*
Norway	22 Nov 1955
Pakistan	15 Sep 1961
Paraguay	13 Jan 2006
Philippines	21 May 1958
Poland	19 Jun 1969
Republic of Korea	13 May 1977
Romania	15 Sep 1970
Russian Federation	10 Jan 1966
Rwanda	15 Apr 1964
Senegal	2 Mar 1966
Serbia[1,2]	12 Mar 2001
Seychelles	24 Jul 1985
Sierra Leone[1]	13 Mar 1962
Singapore[1]	18 Mar 1966
Slovakia[1,3]	28 May 1993
Slovenia[1,2]	6 Jul 1992
South Africa	30 Aug 2002
Spain	26 Sep 1974
St. Lucia	2 Sep 1986
Sweden	31 Jul 1953
Thailand	19 Jun 1961
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1,2]	11 Mar 1996
Tonga[1]	17 Mar 1976
Trinidad and Tobago	19 Oct 1965
Tunisia	3 Dec 1957
Uganda	11 Aug 1983
Ukraine	13 Apr 1966
United Arab Emirates	11 Dec 2003
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	17 Dec 1954
United Republic of Tanzania	26 Mar 1963
Uruguay	24 Jun 1981
Uzbekistan	18 Feb 1997
Vanuatu	2 Jan 2008
Zambia[1]	16 Jun 1975
Zimbabwe	5 Mar 1991

Notes:

[1] These States deposited instruments of succession to the Convention and applied the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency with effect from the date of the succession of State. See Chapter III-2.

[2] The former Yugoslavia applied the Annex as from 5 March 1952. See also note 1 under “Bosnia and Herzegovina”, “Croatia”, “former Yugoslavia”, “Slovenia”, “The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” and “Yugoslavia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 29 December 1966 in respect of the following agencies: ILO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO and IMO. Subsequently, on 6 September 1988 and 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General that it applied the Convention in respect of FAO (second revised text of annex II), WIPO, and UNIDO, and IMF, IBRD, IFC and IDA, respectively. The instrument of accession also contained a reservation, subsequently withdrawn on 26 April 1991. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 586, p. 247. See also note 1 under “Czech Republic” and note 1 under “Slovakia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[5] See note 1 under “Germany” regarding Berlin (West) in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under “Montenegro” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. 12) Annex XII - International Maritime Organization (IMO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

London, 16 January 1959

REGISTRATION: 12 February 1959, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 323, p. 364.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*
Algeria	25 Mar 1964
Argentina	10 Oct 1963
Barbados	19 Nov 1971
Belgium	14 Mar 1962
Brazil	22 Mar 1963
Bulgaria	13 Jun 1968
Burkina Faso	6 Apr 1962
Croatia[1,2]	12 Oct 1992
Cuba	13 Sep 1972
Cyprus	6 May 1964
Czech Republic[2,3]	22 Feb 1993
Denmark	20 May 1960
Estonia	8 Oct 1997
Finland	8 Jun 1959
Gabon	30 Nov 1982
Gambia[2]	1 Aug 1966
Germany[4,5,6]	12 Jan 1962
Guinea	29 Mar 1968
Guyana	13 Sep 1973
Haiti	5 Aug 1959
Hungary[7]	9 Aug 1973
Indonesia	8 Mar 1972
Ireland	10 May 1967
Japan	18 Apr 1963
Kenya	1 Jul 1965
Kuwait	7 Feb 1963
Lao People's Democratic Republic	9 Aug 1960
Madagascar	3 Jan 1966
Malawi	2 Aug 1965
Maldives	26 May 1969
Malta[2]	27 Jun 1968
Montenegro[2,8]	23 Oct 2006
Netherlands	28 Jun 1965
New Zealand[9]	17 Oct 1963
Nigeria[2]	26 Jun 1961
Norway	30 Jan 1961
Pakistan	13 Mar 1962
Russian Federation	10 Jan 1966
Senegal	2 Mar 1966
Serbia[1,2]	12 Mar 2001
Sierra Leone	13 Mar 1962
Slovakia[2,3]	28 May 1993
Slovenia[1]	21 Oct 1998
Sweden	1 Feb 1960
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1,2]	11 Mar 1996
Trinidad and Tobago	19 Oct 1965
Uganda	11 Aug 1983
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	4 Nov 1959

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia applied the Annex as from 8 April 1964. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] These States deposited instruments of succession to the Convention and applied the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency with effect from the date of the succession of State. See Chapter III-2.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 29 December 1966 in respect of the following agencies: ILO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO and IMO. Subsequently, on 6 September 1988 and 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General that it applied the Convention in respect of FAO (second revised text of annex II), WIPO, and UNIDO, and IMF, IBRD, IFC and IDA, respectively. The instrument of accession also contained a reservation, subsequently withdrawn on 26 April 1991. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 586, p. 247. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1

under “Slovakia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[5] See note 1 under “Germany” regarding Berlin (West) in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] The notification of 9 August 1973 was made with the same reservations as those made upon accession.

[8] See note 1 under “Montenegro” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. 12a) Revised text of Annex XII - International Maritime Organization (IMO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

London, 16 May 1968

REGISTRATION: 13 September 1968, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 645, p. 340.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*
Australia	9 May 1986
Bahamas	17 Mar 1977
Bahrain	17 Mar 1977
Belgium	23 Dec 2002
Brazil	11 Feb 1969
Bulgaria	2 Dec 1968
Cameroon	30 Apr 1992
China	11 Sep 1979
Denmark	20 Mar 1969
Dominica	24 Jun 1988
Fiji	21 Jun 1971
Finland	24 Nov 1969
France	2 Aug 2000
Germany[1,2,3]	11 Jun 1985
Greece	21 Jun 1977
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 May 1974
Ireland	27 Dec 1968
Italy	30 Aug 1985
Kuwait	9 Jul 1969
Lithuania	10 Feb 1997
Madagascar	19 Nov 1968
Malta	21 Oct 1968
Mauritius	18 Jul 1969
Netherlands	29 Oct 1969
New Zealand[4]	6 Jun 1969
Norway	1 Oct 1968
Poland	19 Jun 1969
Romania	15 Sep 1970
Seychelles	24 Jul 1985
South Africa	30 Aug 2002
Spain	26 Sep 1974
St. Lucia	2 Sep 1986
Sweden	13 Sep 1968
Tonga	17 Mar 1976
Ukraine	25 Feb 1993
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	28 Nov 1968
Zambia	16 Jun 1975
Zimbabwe	5 Mar 1991

Notes:

[1] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[4] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. 12b) Second Revised text of Annex XII - International Maritime Organization (IMO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

London, 22 November 2001

REGISTRATION: 8 April 2002, No. 521.
TEXT: IMO Resolution A.908 (22).

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*
Estonia	7 Nov 2008
Georgia	18 Jul 2007
Iceland	17 Jan 2006
Latvia	19 Dec 2005
Netherlands[1]	4 Apr 2003
Paraguay	13 Jan 2006
United Arab Emirates	11 Dec 2003
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	17 Jul 2002
Vanuatu	2 Jan 2008

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Netherlands	4 Apr 2003	Aruba and Netherlands Antilles

Notes:

[1] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

2. 13) Annex XIII - International Finance Corporation (IFC) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

Washington, 2 April 1959

REGISTRATION: 22 April 1959, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 327, p. 326.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*
Albania	15 Dec 2003
Argentina	10 Oct 1963
Australia	9 May 1986
Austria	10 Nov 1959
Belgium	14 Mar 1962
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1,2]	1 Sep 1993
Brazil	22 Mar 1963
Bulgaria	24 Jan 2000
Burkina Faso	6 Apr 1962
Cameroon	30 Apr 1992
China	30 Jun 1981
Côte d'Ivoire	4 Jun 1962
Croatia[1,2]	12 Oct 1992
Czech Republic[2,3]	22 Feb 1993
Democratic Republic of the Congo	8 Dec 1964
Denmark	19 Jul 1961
Egypt	24 May 1976
Estonia	7 Nov 2008
Finland	27 Jul 1959
France	2 Aug 2000
Gabon	30 Nov 1982
Gambia[2]	1 Aug 1966
Georgia	18 Jul 2007
Germany[4,5,6]	12 Apr 1962
Greece	21 Jun 1977
Guatemala	26 Jan 2005
Guinea	29 Mar 1968
Guyana	13 Sep 1973
Hungary[7]	12 Nov 1991
Iceland	17 Jan 2006
India	3 Aug 1961
Indonesia	8 Mar 1972
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 May 1974
Ireland	10 May 1967
Italy	30 Aug 1985
Japan	18 Apr 1963
Kenya	1 Jul 1965
Kuwait	7 Feb 1963
Lao People's Democratic Republic	9 Aug 1960
Latvia	19 Dec 2005
Lesotho	26 Nov 1969
Lithuania	10 Feb 1997
Madagascar	3 Jan 1966
Malawi	2 Aug 1965
Malta	13 Feb 1969
Montenegro[2,8]	23 Oct 2006
Morocco	3 Nov 1976
Netherlands	28 Jun 1965
Norway	10 Nov 1960
Pakistan	17 Jul 1962
Paraguay	13 Jan 2006
Philippines	13 Jan 1961
Poland	1 Nov 1990
Russian Federation	29 Jun 1994
Senegal	2 Mar 1966
Serbia[1,2]	12 Mar 2001
Seychelles	24 Jul 1985
Slovakia[2,3]	28 May 1993
Slovenia[1,2]	6 Jul 1992
South Africa	30 Aug 2002
Spain	26 Sep 1974
Sweden	3 Sep 1960
Thailand	19 Jun 1961
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1,2]	11 Mar 1996
Trinidad and Tobago	6 Oct 2004
Uganda	11 Aug 1983
Ukraine	25 Feb 1993
United Arab Emirates	11 Dec 2003
United Republic of Tanzania	10 Apr 1963
Uzbekistan	18 Feb 1997
Vanuatu	2 Jan 2008
Zimbabwe	5 Mar 1991

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia applied the Annex as from 8 April 1964. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] These States deposited instruments of succession to the Convention and applied the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency with effect from the date of the succession of State. See Chapter III-2.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 29 December 1966 in respect of the following agencies: ILO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO and IMO. Subsequently, on 6 September 1988 and 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General that it applied the Convention in respect of FAO (second revised text of annex II), WIPO, and UNIDO, and IMF, IBRD, IFC and IDA, respectively. The instrument of accession also contained a reservation, subsequently withdrawn on 26 April 1991. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 586, p. 247. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] The notification of application of 12 November 1991 contains the following declaration:

"The Convention is being applied on behalf of Hungary as from 29 April 1985 with respect to the [said] specialized agencies."

[8] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. 14) Annex XIV - International Development Association (IDA) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

Washington, 13 February 1962

REGISTRATION: 15 February 1962, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 423, p. 284.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*
Albania	15 Dec 2003
Australia	9 May 1986
Austria	8 Nov 1962
Belgium	14 Mar 1962
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1,2]	1 Sep 1993
Brazil	22 Mar 1963
Cameroon	30 Apr 1992
China	30 Jun 1981
Côte d'Ivoire	4 Jun 1962
Croatia[1,2]	12 Oct 1992
Czech Republic[2,3]	22 Feb 1993
Democratic Republic of the Congo	8 Dec 1964
Denmark	3 Aug 1962
Estonia	7 Nov 2008
Finland	16 Nov 1962
France	2 Aug 2000
Gabon	30 Nov 1982
Gambia[2]	1 Aug 1966
Georgia	18 Jul 2007
Germany[4,5,6]	11 Jun 1985
Greece	21 Jun 1977
Guatemala	18 May 1962
Guinea	29 Mar 1968
Guyana	13 Sep 1973
Hungary[7]	12 Nov 1991
Iceland	17 Jan 2006
Indonesia	8 Mar 1972
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 May 1974
Ireland	10 May 1967
Italy	30 Aug 1985
Japan	18 Apr 1963
Kenya	1 Jul 1965
Kuwait	7 Feb 1963
Latvia	19 Dec 2005
Lesotho	26 Nov 1969
Lithuania	10 Feb 1997
Malawi	2 Aug 1965
Malta[2]	27 Jun 1968
Montenegro[2,8]	23 Oct 2006
Morocco	3 Nov 1976
Netherlands	28 Jun 1965
Niger	15 May 1968
Norway	22 Nov 2000
Pakistan	17 Jul 1962
Paraguay	13 Jan 2006
Russian Federation	29 Jun 1994
Rwanda	23 Jun 1964
Senegal	2 Mar 1966
Serbia[1,2]	12 Mar 2001
Seychelles	24 Jul 1985
Slovakia[2,3]	28 May 1993
Slovenia[1,2]	6 Jul 1992
South Africa	30 Aug 2002
Spain	26 Sep 1974
St. Lucia	2 Sep 1986
Sweden	11 Apr 1962
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1,2]	11 Mar 1996
Uganda	11 Aug 1983
Ukraine	25 Feb 1993
Uzbekistan	18 Feb 1997
Vanuatu	2 Jan 2008
Zimbabwe	5 Mar 1991

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia applied the Annex as from 8 April 1964. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the

"Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] These States deposited instruments of succession to the Convention and applied the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency with effect from the date of the succession of State. See Chapter III-2.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 29 December 1966 in respect of the following agencies: ILO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO and IMO. Subsequently, on 6 September 1988 and 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General that it applied the Convention in respect of FAO (second revised text of annex II), WIPO, and UNIDO, and IMF, IBRD, IFC and IDA, respectively. The instrument of accession also contained a reservation, subsequently withdrawn on 26 April 1991. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 586, p. 247 See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] The notification of application of 12 November 1991 contains the following declaration:

"The Convention is being applied on behalf of Hungary as from 29 April 1985 with respect to the [said] specialized agencies."

[8] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. 15) Annex XV - World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

Geneva, 4 October 1977

REGISTRATION: 19 October 1977, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1057, p. 320.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*	
Australia	9 May	1986
Austria	2 Jul	1991
Belgium	23 Dec	2002
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1,2]	1 Sep	1993
Bulgaria	24 Jan	2000
Cameroon	30 Apr	1992
Croatia[1,2]	12 Oct	1992
Czech Republic[2,3]	22 Feb	1993
Denmark	15 Dec	1983
Estonia	8 Oct	1997
France	2 Aug	2000
Gabon	30 Nov	1982
Georgia	18 Jul	2007
Germany[4,5,6]	20 Aug	1979
Iceland	17 Jan	2006
Italy	30 Aug	1985
Japan	15 Aug	2005
Latvia	19 Dec	2005
Lithuania	10 Feb	1997
Montenegro[2,7]	23 Oct	2006
Norway	22 Nov	2000
Serbia[1,2]	12 Mar	2001
Seychelles	24 Jul	1985
Slovakia[2,3]	28 May	1993
Slovenia[1,2]	6 Jul	1992
South Africa	30 Aug	2002
Spain	12 Dec	2003
St. Lucia	2 Sep	1986
Sweden	1 Mar	1979
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1,2]	11 Mar	1996
Uganda	11 Aug	1983
Ukraine	25 Feb	1993
United Arab Emirates	11 Dec	2003
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	3 Sep	1986
Uzbekistan	18 Feb	1997
Zimbabwe	5 Mar	1991

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia applied the Annex as fromon 8 February 1979. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] These States deposited instruments of succession to the Convention and applied the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency with effect from the date of the succession of State. See Chapter III-2.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 29 December 1966 in respect of the following agencies: ILO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO and IMO. Subsequently, on 6 September 1988 and 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General that it applied the Convention in respect of FAO (second revised text of annex II), WIPO, and UNIDO, and IMF, IBRD, IFC and IDA, respectively. The instrument of accession also contained a reservation, subsequently withdrawn on 26 April 1991. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 586, p. 247. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the

Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. 16) Annex XVI - International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

Rome, 16 December 1977

REGISTRATION: 16 December 1977, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1060, p. 337.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*	
Argentina	27 Sep	2001
Australia	9 May	1986
Belgium	23 Dec	2002
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1,2]	1 Sep	1993
Cameroon	30 Apr	1992
Croatia[1,2]	12 Oct	1992
Cuba	21 Jul	1981
Dominica	24 Jun	1988
Ecuador	20 Nov	1998
France	2 Aug	2000
Georgia	18 Jul	2007
Germany[3,4,5]	20 Aug	1979
Iceland	17 Jan	2006
Italy	30 Aug	1985
Latvia	19 Dec	2005
Lithuania	10 Feb	1997
Montenegro[2,6]	23 Oct	2006
Norway	22 Nov	2000
Serbia[1,2]	12 Mar	2001
Seychelles	24 Jul	1985
Slovenia[1,2]	6 Jul	1992
South Africa	30 Aug	2002
Spain	12 Dec	2003
Sweden	1 Mar	1979
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1,2]	11 Mar	1996
Uganda	11 Aug	1983
Ukraine	25 Feb	1993
United Arab Emirates	11 Dec	2003
Zimbabwe	5 Mar	1991

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia applied the Annex as from 26 January 1979. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] These States deposited instruments of succession to the Convention and applied the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency with effect from the date of the succession of State. See Chapter III-2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. 17) Annex XVII - United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

Vienna, 3 July 1987

REGISTRATION: 15 September 1987, No. 521.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1482, p. 244.

Note: The term *"Participant"* in the present context refers to the State party to the Convention, which has undertaken to apply the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency, in accordance with section 43 of article X thereof.

Participant	*Application*	*Participant*	*Application*
Belgium	23 Dec 2002	Norway	22 Nov 2000
Bulgaria	24 Jan 2000	Slovakia[1,2]	28 May 1993
Cameroon	30 Apr 1992	South Africa	30 Aug 2002
Czech Republic[1,2]	22 Feb 1993	Spain	12 Dec 2003
Dominica	24 Jun 1988	Ukraine	25 Feb 1993
Georgia	18 Jul 2007	United Arab Emirates	11 Dec 2003
Germany[3,4,5]	3 Mar 1989	Uzbekistan	18 Feb 1997
Italy[6]	30 Aug 1985	Vanuatu	2 Jan 2008
Lithuania	10 Feb 1997	Zimbabwe	5 Mar 1991

Notes:

[1] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 29 December 1966 in respect of the following agencies: ILO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO and IMO. Subsequently, on 6 September 1988 and 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General that it applied the Convention in respect of FAO (second revised text of annex II), WIPO, and UNIDO, and IMF, IBRD, IFC and IDA, respectively. The instrument of accession also contained a reservation, subsequently withdrawn on 26 April 1991. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 586, p. 247. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] These States deposited instruments of succession to the Convention and applied the provisions of the Convention to the above specialized agency with effect from the date of the succession of State. See Chapter III-2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The Government of Italy in its instrument of accession has (subject to the declaration made upon accession) undertaken to apply the Convention to the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO). However, the Convention became applicable to UNIDO on 15 September 1987, upon the completion by UNIDO of the procedures provided for by article 37 of the Convention. Until that time, the provision of article 21 (2) (b) of the Constitution of UNIDO, to which Italy is a party, will continue to apply.

2. 18) Annex XVIII - World Tourism Organization (WTO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

Jeju, 30 July 2008

NOT YET IN FORCE: III-2-18.

3. VIENNA CONVENTION ON DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS

Vienna, 18 April 1961

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 April 1964, in accordance with article 51.
REGISTRATION: 24 June 1964, No. 7310.
STATUS: Signatories: 61. Parties: 186.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 500, p. 95.

Note: The Convention was adopted on 14 April 1961 by the United Nations Conference on Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities held at the Neue Hofburg in Vienna, Austria, from 2 March to 14 April 1961. The Conference also adopted the Optional Protocol concerning the Acquisition of Nationality, the Optional Protocol concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, the Final Act and four resolutions annexed to that Act. The Convention and two Protocols were deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The Final Act, by unanimous decision of the Conference, was deposited in the archives of the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Austria. The text of the Final Act and of the annexed resolutions is published in the United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 500, p. 212. For the proceedings of the Conference, see *United Nations Conference on Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities, Official Records*, vols. I and II (United Nations publication, Sales Nos: 61.X.2 and 62.X.1).

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Afghanistan		6 Oct 1965 a
Albania	18 Apr 1961	8 Feb 1988
Algeria		14 Apr 1964 a
Andorra		3 Jul 1996 a
Angola		9 Aug 1990 a
Argentina	18 Apr 1961	10 Oct 1963
Armenia		23 Jun 1993 a
Australia	30 Mar 1962	26 Jan 1968
Austria	18 Apr 1961	28 Apr 1966
Azerbaijan		13 Aug 1992 a
Bahamas		17 Mar 1977 d
Bahrain		2 Nov 1971 a
Bangladesh		13 Jan 1978 d
Barbados		6 May 1968 d
Belarus	18 Apr 1961	14 May 1964
Belgium	23 Oct 1961	2 May 1968
Belize		30 Nov 2000 a
Benin		27 Mar 1967 a
Bhutan		7 Dec 1972 a
Bolivia		28 Dec 1977 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1]		1 Sep 1993 d
Botswana		11 Apr 1969 a
Brazil	18 Apr 1961	25 Mar 1965
Bulgaria	18 Apr 1961	17 Jan 1968
Burkina Faso		4 May 1987 a
Burundi		1 May 1968 a
Cambodia		31 Aug 1965 a
Cameroon		4 Mar 1977 a
Canada	5 Feb 1962	26 May 1966
Cape Verde		30 Jul 1979 a
Central African Republic	28 Mar 1962	19 Mar 1973
Chad		3 Nov 1977 a
Chile	18 Apr 1961	9 Jan 1968
China[2,3,4]	18 Apr 1961	25 Nov 1975 a
Colombia	18 Apr 1961	5 Apr 1973
Comoros		27 Sep 2004 a
Congo		11 Mar 1963 a
Costa Rica	14 Feb 1962	9 Nov 1964
Côte d'Ivoire		1 Oct 1962 a
Croatia[1]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba	16 Jan 1962	26 Sep 1963
Cyprus		10 Sep 1968 a
Czech Republic[5]		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		29 Oct 1980 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo	18 Apr 1961	19 Jul 1965
Denmark	18 Apr 1961	2 Oct 1968
Djibouti		2 Nov 1978 a
Dominica		24 Nov 1987 d
Dominican Republic	30 Mar 1962	14 Jan 1964
Ecuador	18 Apr 1961	21 Sep 1964
Egypt		9 Jun 1964 a
El Salvador		9 Dec 1965 a
Equatorial Guinea		30 Aug 1976 a
Eritrea		14 Jan 1997 a
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Ethiopia		22 Mar 1979 a
Fiji		21 Jun 1971 d
Finland	20 Oct 1961	9 Dec 1969
France	30 Mar 1962	31 Dec 1970
Gabon		2 Apr 1964 a
Georgia		12 Jul 1993 a
Germany[6,7]	18 Apr 1961	11 Nov 1964
Ghana	18 Apr 1961	28 Jun 1962
Greece	29 Mar 1962	16 Jul 1970
Grenada		2 Sep 1992 a
Guatemala	18 Apr 1961	1 Oct 1963
Guinea		10 Jan 1968 a
Guinea-Bissau		11 Aug 1993 a
Guyana		28 Dec 1972 a
Haiti		2 Feb 1978 a
Holy See	18 Apr 1961	17 Apr 1964
Honduras		13 Feb 1968 a
Hungary	18 Apr 1961	24 Sep 1965
Iceland		18 May 1971 a
India		15 Oct 1965 a
Indonesia		4 Jun 1982 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	27 May 1961	3 Feb 1965
Iraq	20 Feb 1962	15 Oct 1963
Ireland	18 Apr 1961	10 May 1967
Israel	18 Apr 1961	11 Aug 1970
Italy	13 Mar 1962	25 Jun 1969
Jamaica		5 Jun 1963 a
Japan	26 Mar 1962	8 Jun 1964
Jordan		29 Jul 1971 a
Kazakhstan		5 Jan 1994 a
Kenya		1 Jul 1965 a
Kiribati		2 Apr 1982 d
Kuwait		23 Jul 1969 a
Kyrgyzstan		7 Oct 1994 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		3 Dec 1962 a
Latvia		13 Feb 1992 a
Lebanon	18 Apr 1961	16 Mar 1971
Lesotho		26 Nov 1969 a
Liberia	18 Apr 1961	15 May 1962
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		7 Jun 1977 a
Liechtenstein	18 Apr 1961	8 May 1964
Lithuania		15 Jan 1992 a
Luxembourg	2 Feb 1962	17 Aug 1966
Madagascar		31 Jul 1963 a
Malawi		19 May 1965 a
Malaysia		9 Nov 1965 a
Maldives		2 Oct 2007 a
Mali		28 Mar 1968 a
Malta[8]		7 Mar 1967 d
Marshall Islands		9 Aug 1991 a
Mauritania		16 Jul 1962 a
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 d
Mexico	18 Apr 1961	16 Jun 1965
Micronesia (Federated States of)		29 Apr 1991 a
Moldova		26 Jan 1993 a
Monaco		4 Oct 2005 a
Mongolia		5 Jan 1967 a
Montenegro[9]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		19 Jun 1968 a
Mozambique		18 Nov 1981 a
Myanmar		7 Mar 1980 a
Namibia		14 Sep 1992 a
Nauru		5 May 1978 d
Nepal		28 Sep 1965 a
Netherlands[10]		7 Sep 1984 a
New Zealand[11]	28 Mar 1962	23 Sep 1970
Nicaragua		31 Oct 1975 a
Niger		5 Dec 1962 a
Nigeria	31 Mar 1962	19 Jun 1967
Norway	18 Apr 1961	24 Oct 1967
Oman		31 May 1974 a
Pakistan	29 Mar 1962	29 Mar 1962
Panama	18 Apr 1961	4 Dec 1963
Papua New Guinea		4 Dec 1975 d
Paraguay		23 Dec 1969 a
Peru		18 Dec 1968 a
Philippines	20 Oct 1961	15 Nov 1965
Poland	18 Apr 1961	19 Apr 1965
Portugal[3]		11 Sep 1968 a
Qatar		6 Jun 1986 a
Republic of Korea[12]	28 Mar 1962	28 Dec 1970
Romania	18 Apr 1961	15 Nov 1968
Russian Federation	18 Apr 1961	25 Mar 1964
Rwanda		15 Apr 1964 a

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Samoa		26 Oct 1987 a
San Marino	25 Oct 1961	8 Sep 1965
Sao Tome and Principe		3 May 1983 a
Saudi Arabia		10 Feb 1981 a
Senegal	18 Apr 1961	12 Oct 1972
Serbia[1]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		29 May 1979 a
Sierra Leone		13 Aug 1962 a
Singapore		1 Apr 2005 a
Slovakia[5]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[1]		6 Jul 1992 d
Somalia		29 Mar 1968 a
South Africa	28 Mar 1962	21 Aug 1989
Spain		21 Nov 1967 a
Sri Lanka	18 Apr 1961	2 Jun 1978
St. Lucia		27 Aug 1986 d
St. Vincent and the Grenadines		27 Apr 1999 d
Sudan		13 Apr 1981 a
Suriname		28 Oct 1992 a
Swaziland		25 Apr 1969 a
Sweden	18 Apr 1961	21 Mar 1967
Switzerland	18 Apr 1961	30 Oct 1963
Syrian Arab Republic		4 Aug 1978 a
Tajikistan		6 May 1996 a
Thailand	30 Oct 1961	23 Jan 1985
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1]		18 Aug 1993 d
Timor-Leste		30 Jan 2004 a
Togo		27 Nov 1970 a
Tonga		31 Jan 1973 d
Trinidad and Tobago		19 Oct 1965 a
Tunisia		24 Jan 1968 a
Turkey		6 Mar 1985 a
Turkmenistan		25 Sep 1996 a
Tuvalu[13]		15 Sep 1982 d
Uganda		15 Apr 1965 a
Ukraine	18 Apr 1961	12 Jun 1964
United Arab Emirates		24 Feb 1977 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[2]	11 Dec 1961	1 Sep 1964
United Republic of Tanzania	27 Feb 1962	5 Nov 1962
United States of America	29 Jun 1961	13 Nov 1972
Uruguay	18 Apr 1961	10 Mar 1970
Uzbekistan		2 Mar 1992 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	18 Apr 1961	16 Mar 1965
Viet Nam[14]		26 Aug 1980 a
Yemen[15]		24 Nov 1976 a
Zambia[16]		16 Jun 1975 d
Zimbabwe		13 May 1991 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto see hereinafter.)

AUSTRALIA

14 March 1968

"The Government of the Commonwealth of Australia does not regard the statements concerning paragraph (1) of Article 11 made by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Mongolian People's Republic as modifying any rights or obligations under that paragraph.

"The Government of the Commonwealth of Australia declares that it does not recognize as valid the reservations to paragraph 2, Article 37, of the Convention made by the United Arab Republic and by Cambodia."

20 November 1970

"The Government of the Commonwealth of Australia declares that it does not recognize as valid the reservations to article 37, paragraph 2, of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by Morocco and Portugal."

6 September 1973

"The Government of Australia does not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention made by the German Democratic Republic, in a letter accompanying the instrument of accession as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph."

25 January 1977

"The Government of Australia does not regard as valid the reservations made by the Government of the People's

Republic of China to paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 of article 37 of that Convention."

21 June 1978

"The Government of Australia does not regard the reservation made by the Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen to paragraph (1) of article 11 as modifying any rights or obligations under that paragraph."

22 February 1983

"Australia does not regard as valid the reservations made by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the State of Bahrain, the State of Kuwait and the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, in respect of treatment of the diplomatic bag under article 27 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations."

10 February 1987

"Australia does not regard as valid the reservations made by the State of Qatar and the Yemen Arab Republic in respect of treatment of the diplomatic bag under Article 27 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 18 April 1961."

BAHRAIN[17]

"1. With respect to paragraph 3 of article 27, relating to the `Diplomatic Bag', the Government of the State of Bahrain reserves its right to open the diplomatic bag if there are serious grounds for presuming that it contains articles the import or export of which is prohibited by law.

"2. The approval of this Convention does not constitute a recognition of Israel, or amount to entering with it into any transaction required by the aforesaid Convention."

BELARUS

Reservation concerning article 11, paragraph 1:

In accordance with the principle of the equality of rights of States, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that any difference of opinion regarding the size of a diplomatic mission should be settled by agreement between the sending State and the receiving State.

Declaration concerning articles 48 and 50:

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers it necessary to draw attention to the discriminatory nature of articles 48 and 50 of the Convention, under the terms of which a number of States are precluded from acceding to the Convention. The Convention deals with matters which affect the interests of all States and should therefore be open for accession by all States. In accordance with the principle of sovereign equality no State has the right to bar other States from accession to a Convention of this nature.

2 November 1977

The Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not recognize the validity of the reservation made by the Chinese People's Republic to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations.

16 October 1986

[Same reservation, mutatis mutandis,as the one made by the Russian Federation on 6 October 1986.]

11 November 1986

[Same reservation, mutatis mutandis,as the one made by the Russian Federation on 6 November 1986.]

BOTSWANA

"Subject to the reservation that article 37 of the Convention should be applicable on the basis of reciprocity only."

BULGARIA

Reservation concerning article 11, paragraph 1:

In accordance with the principle of the equality of States, the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that any difference of opinion regarding the size of a diplomatic mission should be settled by agreement between the sending State and the receiving State.

Declaration concerning articles 48 and 50:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers it necessary to draw attention to the discriminatory nature of articles 48 and 50 of the Convention, under the terms of which a number of States are precluded from acceding to the Convention. The provisions of these articles are inconsistent with the very nature of the Con- vention, which is universal in character and should be open for accession by all States. In accordance with the principle of equality, no State has the right to bar other States from accession to a convention of this kind.

CAMBODIA

The diplomatic immunities and privileges provided for in article 37, paragraph 2, of the afore-mentioned Convention, recognized and admitted in customary law and in the practice of States in favour of heads of missions and members of diplomatic staff of the mission, cannot be granted by the Royal Government of Cambodia for the benefit of other categories of mission staff, including administrative and technical staff.

CANADA

"The Government of Canada does not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of Article 11 of the Convention made by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as modifying any rights or obligations under this paragraph."

16 March 1978

"The Government of Canada does not regard as valid the reservations to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the People's Republic of China. Similarly the Government of Canada does not regard as valid the reservations to paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Convention which have been made by the Government of the United Arab Republic (now the Arab Republic of Egypt), the Government of Cambodia (now Kampuchea) and the Government of the Kingdom of Morocco.

"The Government of Canada does not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention made by the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic, the Government of Bulgaria, the Government of the German Demo- cratic Republic and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph.

"The Government of Canada also desires to place on record that it does not regard as valid the reservations to paragraph 3 of article 27 of the Convention made by the Government of Bahrain and the reservations to paragraph 4 of article 27 made by the State of Kuwait and the Government of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya."

CHINA[18]

The Government of the People's Republic of China holds reservations on the provisions about nuncios and the representa- tive of the Holy See in articles 14 and 16 and on the provisions of paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37.

CUBA

The Revolutionary Government of Cuba makes an explicit reservation in respect of the provisions of articles 48 and 50 of the Convention, because it considers that, in view of the nature of the contents of the Convention and the subject it concerns, all free and sovereign States have the right to participate in it: for that reason, the Revolutionary Government of Cuba favours facilitating the admission of all countries of the International Community, without any distinction based on the extent of a State's territory, the number of its inhabitants or its social, economic or political system.

DENMARK

"The Government of Denmark does not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of Article 11 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph. Further, the Government of Denmark does not regard as valid the reservation to paragraph 2 of Article 37 made by the United Arab Republic, Cambodia and Morocco. This statement shall not be regarded as precluding the entry into force of the Convention between Denmark and the above-mentioned countries."

5 August 1970

"The Government of Denmark does not regard the reserva- tion to article 37, paragraph 2, of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by Portugal on 11th of September 1968 as valid.

"This statement shall not be regarded as precluding the entry into force of the said Convention between Denmark and Portu- gal."

29 March 1977

"The Government of Denmark does not regard as valid the reservations made by the People's Republic of China to article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 18 April 1961. This statement is not to be regarded as preventing the Convention's entry into force as between Denmark and the People's Republic of China.

ECUADOR[19]

EGYPT[17,20]

"1. Paragraph 2 of article 37 shall not apply."

FRANCE

The Government of the French Republic considers that article 38, paragraph 1, is to be interpreted as granting to a diplomatic agent who is a national of or permanently resident in the receiving State only immunity from jurisdiction, and inviolability, both being confined to official acts performed by the said diplomatic agent in the exercise of his functions.

The Government of the French Republic declares that the provisions of the bilateral agreements in force between France and foreign States are not affected by the provisions of the Con- vention.

The Government of the French Republic does not regard the statements concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 made by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as modifying any rights or obligations under that paragraph.

The Government of the French Republic does not regard as valid the reservation to article 27, paragraph 4, made by the State of Kuwait.

The Government of the French Republic does not regard as valid the reservations to article 37, paragraph 2, made by the Government of Cambodia, the Government of the Kingdom of Morocco, the Government of Portugal and the Government of the United Arab Republic.

None of these declarations shall be regarded as an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the French Republic and the States mentioned.

28 December 1976

The Government of the French Republic does not regard as valid the reservations made by the People's Republic of China to article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 18 April 1961. This declaration is not to be regarded as preventing the Convention's entry into force as between the French Republic and the People's Republic of China.

29 August 1986

1. The Government of the French Republic declares that it does not recognize as valid the reservation entered by the Government of the Yemen Arab Republic which would make it permissible to request the opening of the diplomatic bag and to return it to the sender. The Government of the French Republic considers that this or any similar reservation is inconsistent with the object and the purpose of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations done at Vienna on 18April 1961.

2. This declaration shall not be regarded as an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between the French Republic and the Yemen Arab Republic.

GREECE[21]

GUATEMALA

23 December 1963

The Government of Guatemala rejects formally the reserva- tions to articles 48 and 50 of the Convention made by the Government of Cuba in its instrument of ratification.

HAITI

9 May 1972

The Haitian Government considers that the reservation expressed by the Government of Bahrain with regard to the inviolability of diplomatic correspondence may destroy the effectiveness of the Convention, one of the main aims of which is precisely to put an end to certain practices impeding the performance of the functions assigned to diplomatic agents.

HUNGARY

"The Hungarian People's Republic considers it necessary to draw attention to the discriminatory nature of articles 48 and 50 of the Convention, under the terms of which a number of States were precluded from signing and are precluded from acceding to the Convention. The Convention deals with matters which affect the interests of all States and therefore, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, no State should be barred from participation in a Convention of this nature."

7 July 1975

"The reservation made by the Government of Bahrain to article 27, paragraph 3, of the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations is contrary to the principle of the inviolability of the diplomatic bag which is generally recognized in the international practice, and is incompatible with the objectives of the Convention.

"Therefore, the Hungarian People's Republic does not recognize this reservation as valid."

6 September 1978

"The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic does not recognize the validity of the reservation made by the Chinese People's Republic to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations."

IRAQ

"With reservation that paragraph 2 of article 37 shall be applied on the basis of reciprocity."

IRELAND

17 January 1978

"The Government of Ireland object to the reservations made by the Government of the People's Republic of China concerning the provisions relating to Nuncios and the representative of the Holy See in articles 14 and 16 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. The Government of Ireland do not regard these reservations as modifying any rights or obligations under those articles.

"The Government of Ireland do not regard as valid the reser- vations made by the Government of the People's Republic of China to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37.

"This statement is not to be regarded as preventing the entry into force of the Convention as between Ireland and the People's Republic of China."

JAPAN

Declaration with regard to article 34 (a) of the said Convention:

"It is understood that the taxes referred to in article 34 (a) include those collected by special collectors under the laws and regulations of Japan provided that they are normally incorporated in the price of goods or services. For example, in the case of the travelling tax, railway, shipping and airline companies are made special collectors of the tax by the Travelling Tax Law. Passengers of railroad trains, vessels and airplanes who are legally liable to pay the tax for their travels within Japan are required to purchase travel tickets normally at a price incorporating the tax with out being specifically informed of its amount. Accordingly, taxes collected by special collectors such as the travelling tax have to be considered as the indirect taxes normally incorporated in the price of goods or services referred to in article 34 (a)."

27 January 1987

"With respect to paragraphs 3 and 4 of article 27 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 18 April 1961, the Government of Japan believes that the protection of diplomatic correspondence by means of diplomatic bags constitutes an important element of the Convention, and any reservation intended to allow a receiving State to open diplomatic bags without the consent of the sending State is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. Therefore the Government of Japan does not regard as valid the reservations concerning article 27 of the Convention made by the Government of Bahrain and the Government of Qatar on 2 November 1971 and 6 June 1986, respectively. The Government of Japan also desires to record that the above-stated position is applicable to any reservations to the same effect to be made in the future by other countries."

KUWAIT[17]

If the State of Kuwait has reason to believe that the diplomatic pouch contains something which may not be sent by pouch under paragraph 4 of article 27 of the Convention, it considers that it has the right to request that the pouch be opened in the presence of the representative of the diplomatic mission [concerned]. If this request is refused by the authorities of the sending State, the diplomatic pouch shall be returned to its place of origin.

The Government of Kuwait declares that its accession to the Convention does not imply recognition of "Israel" or entering with it into relations governed by the Convention thereto acceded.

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA[17]

(1) The accession of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to said Convention cannot be interpreted as signifying in any form whatsoever any recognition of Israel nor does accession to said Convention imply the entertaining of any relations or obligations with Israel.

(2) The Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya will not be bound by paragraph 3 of article 37 of the Convention except on the basis of reciprocity.

(3) In the event that the authorities of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya entertain strong doubts that the contents of a diplomatic pouch include items which may not be sent by diplomatic pouch in accordance with paragraph 4 of article 27 of said Convention, the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya reserves its right to request the opening of such pouch in the presence of an official representative of the diplomatic mission concerned. If such request is denied by the authorities of the sending state, the diplomatic pouch shall be returned to its place of origin.

LUXEMBOURG

18 January 1965

With reference to the reservation and declaration made by the Governments of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist

Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics upon ratification of the Convention, the Government of Luxembourg regrets that it cannot accept that reservation or that declaration which tends to modify the effect of certain provisions of the Convention.

25 October 1965

With reference to the statement made by the Government of Hungary upon ratification of the Convention, the Government of Luxembourg regrets that it cannot accept this declaration.

MALTA

"The Government of Malta wishes to declare that paragraph 2 of article 37 shall be applied on the basis of reciprocity."

MONGOLIA[22]

Referring to articles 48 and 50, the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic deems it necessary to draw attention to the discriminatory nature of articles 48 and 50 of the Vienna Convention and declares that, as the Convention deals with matters affecting the interests of all States, it should be open for accession by all States.

18 January 1978

"Reservation made by the Government of Bahrain to paragraph 3, article 27 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations is incompatible with the very object and purpose of the Convention. Therefore the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the above-mentioned reservation.

"The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic does not recognize the validity of the reservation made by the Government of the People's Republic of China to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations."

MOROCCO

The Kingdom of Morocco accedes to the Convention subject to the reservation that paragraph 2 of article 37 is not applicable.

MOZAMBIQUE

"The People's Republic of Mozambique takes this opportun-ity to draw the attention to the discriminatory nature of the articles 48 and 50 of the present Convention which preclude a number of States from acceding to it. In view of its broad scope which affects the interest of all States in the world the present Convention should therefore be open for participation of all States."

"The People's Republic of Mozambique considers that the joint participation of States in a convention does not represent their official recognition."

NEPAL

"Subject to the reservation with regard to article 8, paragraph 3, of the Convention, that the prior consent to His Majesty's Government of Nepal shall be required for the appointment to the diplomatic staff of any mission in Nepal of any national of a third State who is not also a national of the sending State."

NEW ZEALAND

"The Government of New Zealand does not regard the state- ments concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph. Further, the Government of New Zealand does not accept the reservation to paragraph 2 of Article 37 of the Convention made by Cambodia, Morocco, Portugal and the United Arab Republic."

25 January 1977

"The Government of New Zealand does not regard as valid the reservations to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 18 April 1961 made by the Government of the People's Republic of China and considers that those paragraphs are in force between New Zealand and the People's Republic of China."

OMAN

"The accession of this Convention does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the Sultanate of Oman and Israel."

POLAND

3 November 1975

"The reservation made by the Government of Bahrain to article 27, paragraph 3 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, done at Vienna on 18 April 1961, is not compatible with the object and purpose of this Convention. It is contrary to fundamental principles of diplomatic international law. Therefore, the Polish People's Republic does not recognize this reser- vation as valid."

7 March 1978

"The principles of inviolability of diplomatic pouch and freedom of communication are generally recognized in interna- tional law and cannot be changed by unilateral reservation.

"This objection does not prevent entry into force of the Convention as between the Polish People's Republic and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya."

PORTUGAL[23]

QATAR[17]

I. On article 27, para. 3:

The Government of the State of Qatar reserves its right to open a diplomatic bag in the following two situations:

1. The abuse, observed in flagrante delicto, of the diplo- matic bag for unlawful purposes incompatible with the aims of the relevant rule of immunity, by putting therein items other that the diplomatic documents and articles for official use mentioned in para.4 of the said article, in violation of the obligations prescribed by the Government and by international law and custom.

In such a case both the foreign Ministry and the Mission concerned will be notified. The bag will not be opened except with the approval by the Foreign Ministry.

The contraband articles will be seized in the presence of a representative of the Ministry and the Mission.

2. The existence of strong indications or suspicions that the said violations have been perpetrated.

In such a case the bag will not be opened except with the approval of the Foreign Ministry and in the presence of a member of the Mission concerned. If permission to open the bag is denied it will be returned to its place of origin.

II. On article 37, para. 2:

The State of Qatar shall not be bound by para. 2 of article 37.

III. Accession to this Convention does not mean in any way recognition of Israel and does not entail entering with it into any transactions regulated by this Convention.

ROMANIA

The Council of State of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the provisions of articles 48 and 50 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, done at Vienna on 18 April 1961, are at variance with the principle that all States have the right to become parties to multilateral treaties governing matters of general interest.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Reservation concerning article 11, paragraph 1:

In accordance with the principle of the equality of rights of States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers that any difference of opinion regarding the size of a diplomatic mission should be settled by agreement between the sending State and the receiving State.

Declaration concerning articles 48 and 50:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers it necess- ary to draw attention to the discriminatory nature of articles 48 and 50 of the Convention, under the terms of which a number of States are precluded from acceding to the Convention. The Con- vention deals with matters which affect the interests of all States and should therefore be open for accession by all States. In accordance with the principle of sovereign equality, no State has the right to bar other States from accession to a Convention of this nature.

6 June 1972

With respect to the reservation made by Bahrain to article 27 (3):

... This reservation is contrary to the principle of the inviol- ability of the diplomatic bag, which is recognized in international practice, and is therefore unacceptable.

11 October 1977

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not recognize the validity of the reservation expressed by the People's Republic of China concerning paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961.

7 November 1977

"The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the reservation made by the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya concerning article 27 of the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations."

16 February 1982

"The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not recognize the validity of the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia on its accession to the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, since that reservation is contrary to one of the most important provisions of the Convention, namely, that the diplomatic bag shall not be opened or detained."

6 October 1986

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not recognize as valid the reservations of the Government of Qatar with respect to article 27, paragraph 3 and article 37, paragraph 2 of the 1961 Convention on Diplomatic Relations. The Government of the USSR considers that the reservations in question are illegal, since they conflict with the purposes of the Convention.

6 November 1986

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not recognize as lawful the reservations of the Government of Yemen with respect to articles 27, 36 and 37 of the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, since those reservations conflict with the purposes of the Convention.

SAUDI ARABIA[17]

Reservations:

1. If the authorities of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia suspect that the diplomatic pouch or any parcel therein contains matters which may not be sent through the diplomatic pouch, such authorities may request the opening of the parcel in their presence and in the presence of a representative appointed by the diplomatic mission concerned. If such request is rejected, the pouch or parcel shall be returned back.

2. Accession to this Convention shall not constitute a recognition of Israel or lead to any kind of intercourse with it or the establishment of any relations with Israel under the Conven- tion.

SUDAN[17]

Reservations:

"The diplomatic immunities and privileges provided for in article 37 paragraph 2 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961, recognized and admitted in customary law and in the practice of States in favour of heads of missions and members of diplomatic staff of the mission, cannot be granted by the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan for other categories of mission staff except on the basis of reciprocity.

"The Government of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan reserves the right to interpret article 38 as not granting to a diplomatic agent who is a national of or permanent resident in the Sudan any immunity from jurisdiction, and inviolability, even though the acts complained of are official acts performed by the said diplomatic agent in the exercise of his functions."

Understanding:

"The Government of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan understands that its ratification of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961 does not imply whatsoever recognition of Israel or entering with it into relations governed by the said Convention."

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC[17,24]

15 March 1979

1. The Syrian Arab Republic does not recognize Israel and will not enter into dealings with it.

2. The Optional Protocol Concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes does not enter into force for the Syrian Arab Republic.

3. The exemption provided for in article 36, paragraph 1, shall not apply to the administrative and technical staff of the mission except during the first six months following their arrival in the receiving State.

UKRAINE

Reservation concerning article 11, paragraph 1:

In accordance with the principle of the equality of rights of States, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that any difference of opinion regarding the size of a diplomatic mission should be settled by agreement between the sending State and the receiving State.

Declaration concerning articles 48 and 50:

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic considers it necess- ary to draw attention to the discriminatory nature of articles 48 and 50 of the Convention, under the terms of which a number of States are precluded from acceding to the Convention. The Con- vention deals with matters which affect the interests of all States and should therefore be open for accession by all States. In accordance with the principle of sovereign equality, no State has the right to bar other States from accession to a Convention of this nature.

28 July 1972

The reservation made by the Government of Bahrain to the above-mentioned Convention is contrary to the principle of the inviolability of the diplomatic bag, which is generally recognized in international practice, and is therefore unacceptable to the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

24 October 1977

"The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not recognize as valid the reservation to article 37, paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the People's Republic of China."

20 October 1986

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis,as the one made by the Russian Federation on 6 October1986.]

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

"The accession of the United Arab Emirates to this Conven- tion shall in no way amount to recognition of nor the establish- ment of any treaty relation with Israel."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

1 September 1964

"The Government of the United Kingdom do not regard as valid the reservation to paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the United Arab Republic. Further, the Government of the United Kingdom do not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention made by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph."

7 June 1967

"The Government of the United Kingdom do not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention made by the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph."

29 March 1968

"The Government of the United Kingdom do not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention made by the Government of Bulgaria as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph."

19 June 1968

"The Government of the United Kingdom do not regard as valid the reservation to paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the Government of Cambodia."

23 August 1968

"The Government of the United Kingdom do not regard as valid the reservation to paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the Kingdom of Morocco."

10 December 1968

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland do not regard as valid the reservation to paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the Government of Portugal."

13 March 1973

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wish to put on record that they do not regard as valid the reservation to paragraph 3 of Article 27 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the Government of Bahrain."

16 April 1973

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wish to place on record that they do not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of Article 11 of the Convention made by the German Democratic Republic, in a letter accompanying the instrument of accession, as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph."

25 January 1977

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland do not regard as valid the reservations to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the

Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the People's Republic of China".

4 February 1977

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wish to place on record that they do not regard the reservation concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention, made by the Government of Democratic Yemen, as modifying any rights or obligations under that paragraph."

19 February 1987

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wish to place on record that they do not regard as valid the reservations to paragraph 3 of article 27, and to paragraph 2 of article 37, of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the Government of the State of Qatar."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2 July 1974

"The Government of the United States of America ... states its objection to reservations with respect to paragraph 3 of article 27 by Bahrain; with respect to paragraph 4 of article 27 by Kuwait; with respect to paragraph 2 of article 37 by the United Arab Republic (now the Arab Republic of Egypt), by Cambodia (now the Khmer Republic) and by Morocco, respectively. The Government of the United States, however, considers the Convention as continuing in force between it and the respective above-mentioned States except for the provisions to which the reservations are addressed in each case."

4 September 1987

"The Government of the United States of America wishes to state its objections to the reservations regarding the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made with respect to paragraph 4 of Article 27 by the Yemen Arab Republic and with respect to paragraph 3 of Article 27 and paragraph 2 of Article 37 by the State of Qatar, respectively.

...

The Government of the United States, however, considers the [Convention] as continuing in force between it and the respective above-mentioned States except for the provisions to which the reservations are addressed in each case."

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)[25]

Under the Constitution of Venezuela, all Venezuelan nationals are equal before the law and none may enjoy special privileges; for that reason [the Government of Venezuela] make[s] a formal reservation to article 38 of the Convention.

VIET NAM

1. The degrees of privileges and immunities accorded the administrative and technical staff and the members of their families as stipulated in paragraph 2, article 37 of the Convention should be agreed upon in detail by the concerned States;

2. The provisions of articles 48 and 50 of the Convention are of a discriminatory character, which is not in accordance with the principle of equality of the sovereignty among States and limits the universality of the Convention. The Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, therefore, holds the view that all States have the right to adhere to the said Convention.

YEMEN[15,17]

Reservation concerning article 11, paragraph 1:

In conformity with the principle of equality among States, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen holds that any difference of opinion regarding the size of the diplomatic mission should be settled by agreement between the sending State and the receiving State.

Declaration:

The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen states that its acceptance of the provisions of the Convention does not, in any way whatsoever, imply recognition of, or entering into contractual relations with, Israel.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRALIA

14 March 1968

"The Government of the Commonwealth of Australia does not regard the statements concerning paragraph (1) of Article 11 made by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Mongolian People's Republic as modifying any rights or obligations under that paragraph.

"The Government of the Commonwealth of Australia declares that it does not recognize as valid the reservations to paragraph 2, Article 37, of the Convention made by the United Arab Republic and by Cambodia."

20 November 1970

"The Government of the Commonwealth of Australia declares that it does not recognize as valid the reservations to article 37, paragraph 2, of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by Morocco and Portugal."

6 September 1973

"The Government of Australia does not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention made by the German Democratic Republic, in a letter accompanying the instrument of accession as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph."

25 January 1977

"The Government of Australia does not regard as valid the reservations made by the Government of the People's

Republic of China to paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 of article 37 of that Convention."

21 June 1978

"The Government of Australia does not regard the reservation made by the Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen to paragraph (1) of article 11 as modifying any rights or obligations under that paragraph."

22 February 1983

"Australia does not regard as valid the reservations made by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the State of Bahrain, the State of Kuwait and the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, in respect of treatment of the diplomatic bag under article 27 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations."

10 February 1987

"Australia does not regard as valid the reservations made by the State of Qatar and the Yemen Arab Republic in respect of treatment of the diplomatic bag under Article 27 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 18 April 1961."

BAHAMAS[26]

BELARUS

2 November 1977

The Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not recognize the validity of the reservation made by the Chinese People's Republic to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations.

16 October 1986

[Same reservation, mutatis mutandis,as the one made by the Russian Federation on 6 October 1986.]

11 November 1986

[Same reservation, mutatis mutandis,as the one made by the Russian Federation on 6 November 1986.]

BELGIUM

The Belgian Government considers the statement made by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 to be incompatible with the letter and spirit of the Convention and does not regard it as modifying any rights or obligations under that paragraph.

The Belgian Government also considers the reservation made by the United Arab Republic and the Kingdom of Cambodia to paragraph 2 of article 37 to be incompatible with the letter and spirit of the Convention.

28 January 1975

The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium objects to the reservations made with respect to article 27, paragraph 3, by Bahrain and with respect to article 37, paragraph 2, by the United Arab Republic (now the Arab Republic of Egypt), Cambodia (now the Khmer Republic) and Morocco. The Government nevertheless considers that the Convention remains in force as between it and the aforementioned States, respectively, except in respect of the provisions which in each case are the subject of the said reservations.

BULGARIA

22 September 1972

The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria cannot regard the reservation made by the Bahraini Government with respect to article 27, paragraph 3, of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations as valid.

18 August 1977

"The Bulgarian Government does not consider itself to be bound by the reservation made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya concerning the application of article 27, paragraph 3, of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations."

23 June 1981

"The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria does not consider itself bound by the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia on its accession to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations regarding the immunity of the diplomatic bag and the right of the competent authorities of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to demand the open- ing of the diplomatic bag and, in case of refusal on the part of the diplomatic mission concerned, its return. It is the understanding of the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria that the reservation thus made is in violation of article 27, para. 4 of the 1961 Convention on Diplomatic Relations."

CANADA

"The Government of Canada does not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of Article 11 of the Convention made by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as modifying any rights or obligations under this paragraph."

16 March 1978

"The Government of Canada does not regard as valid the reservations to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the People's Republic of China. Similarly the Government of Canada does not regard as valid the reservations to paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Convention which have been made by the Government of the United Arab Republic (now the Arab Republic of Egypt), the Government of Cambodia (now Kampuchea) and the Government of the Kingdom of Morocco.

"The Government of Canada does not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention made by the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic, the Government of Bulgaria, the Government of the German Demo- cratic Republic and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph.

"The Government of Canada also desires to place on record that it does not regard as valid the reservations to paragraph 3 of article 27 of the Convention made by the Government of Bahrain and the reservations to paragraph 4 of article 27 made by the State of Kuwait and the Government of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya."

CZECH REPUBLIC[5]

DENMARK

"The Government of Denmark does not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of Article 11 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph. Further, the Government of Denmark does not regard as valid the reservation to paragraph 2 of Article 37 made by the United Arab Republic, Cambodia and Morocco. This statement shall not be regarded as precluding the entry into force of the Convention between Denmark and the above-mentioned countries."

5 August 1970

"The Government of Denmark does not regard the reserva- tion to article 37, paragraph 2, of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by Portugal on 11th of September 1968 as valid.

"This statement shall not be regarded as precluding the entry into force of the said Convention between Denmark and Portu- gal."

29 March 1977

"The Government of Denmark does not regard as valid the reservations made by the People's Republic of China to article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 18 April 1961. This statement is not to be regarded as preventing the Convention's entry into force as between Denmark and the People's Republic of China.

FRANCE

The Government of the French Republic does not regard the statements concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 made by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as modifying any rights or obligations under that paragraph.

The Government of the French Republic does not regard as valid the reservation to article 27, paragraph 4, made by the State of Kuwait.

The Government of the French Republic does not regard as valid the reservations to article 37, paragraph 2, made by the Government of Cambodia, the Government of the Kingdom of Morocco, the Government of Portugal and the Government of the United Arab Republic.

None of these declarations shall be regarded as an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the French Republic and the States mentioned.

28 December 1976

The Government of the French Republic does not regard as valid the reservations made by the People's Republic of China to article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 18 April 1961. This declaration is not to be regarded as preventing the Convention's entry into force as between the French Republic and the People's Republic of China.

29 August 1986

1. The Government of the French Republic declares that it does not recognize as valid the reservation entered by the Government of the Yemen Arab Republic which would make it permissible to request the opening of the diplomatic bag and to return it to the sender. The Government of the French Republic considers that this or any similar reservation is inconsistent with the object and the purpose of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations done at Vienna on 18April 1961.

2. This declaration shall not be regarded as an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between the French Republic and the Yemen Arab Republic.

GERMANY[6]

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany con- siders as incompatible with the letter and spirit of the Convention the reservations made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic concerning article 11 of the Convention."

Objections, identical in essence, mutatis mutandis, were also formulated by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany in regard to reservations made by various states, as follows:

i) 16 March 1967: In respect of the reservations by the United Arab Republic and the Kingdom of Cambodia concerning article 37, paragraph 2.

ii) 10 May 1967: In respect of the reservation made by the Mongolian People's Republic concerning article 11.

iii) 9 July 1968: In respect of the reservation made by the People's Republic of Bulgaria concerning article 11, paragraph 1.

iv) 23 December 1968: In respect of the reservations made by the Kingdom of Morocco and by Portugal concerning article 37, paragraph 2.

v) 5 September 1974: In respect of the reservation made by the German Democratic Republic concerning article 11, para. 1.

vi) 4 February 1975: In respect of the reservation made by Bahrain concerning article 27, paragraph 3.

vii) 4 March 1977: In respect of the reservation made by the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen concerning article 11, paragraph 1.

viii) 6 May 1977: In respect of the reservations made by the People's Republic of China concerning article 37.

ix) 19 September 1977: In respect of the reservation made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya concerning article 27.

x) 11 July 1979: In respect of the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic concerning article 36, paragraph 1.

xi) 11 December 1980: In respect of the declaration made by the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam concerning article 37, paragraph 2.

xii) 15 May 1981: In respect of the reservation made by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia concerning article 27.

xiii) 30 September 1981: In respect of the reservations made by the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan concerning article 37, paragraph 2 and of article 38.

xiv) 3 March 1987: In respect of the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic and the State of Qatar in respect of articles 27 (3) and 37 (2).

In the case of objections under paragraphs viii), ix), x), xii) and xiii), the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany specified that the declaration is not to be interpreted as preventing the entry into force of the Convention as between the Federal Republic of Germany and the respective States.

GREECE

The Government of Greece cannot accept the reservation to paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention made by Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Mongolia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as well as the reservation to paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Convention made by Cambodia, Morocco, Portugal and the United Arab Republic.

GUATEMALA

23 December 1963

The Government of Guatemala rejects formally the reservations to articles 48 and 50 of the Convention made by the Government of Cuba in its instrument of ratification.

HAITI

9 May 1972

The Haitian Government considers that the reservation expressed by the Government of Bahrain with regard to the inviolability of diplomatic correspondence may destroy the effectiveness of the Convention, one of the main aims of which is precisely to put an end to certain practices impeding the performance of the functions assigned to diplomatic agents.

HUNGARY

7 July 1975

"The reservation made by the Government of Bahrain to article 27, paragraph 3, of the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations is contrary to the principle of the inviolability of the diplomatic bag which is generally recognized in the international practice, and is incompatible with the objectives of the Convention.

"Therefore, the Hungarian People's Republic does not recognize this reservation as valid."

6 September 1978

"The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic does not recognize the validity of the reservation made by the Chinese People's Republic to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations."

IRELAND

17 January 1978

"The Government of Ireland object to the reservations made by the Government of the People's Republic of China concerning the provisions relating to Nuncios and the representative of the Holy See in articles 14 and 16 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. The Government of Ireland do not regard these reservations as modifying any rights or obligations under those articles.

"The Government of Ireland do not regard as valid the reservations made by the Government of the People's Republic of China to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37.

"This statement is not to be regarded as preventing the entry into force of the Convention as between Ireland and the People's Republic of China."

JAPAN

27 January 1987

"With respect to paragraphs 3 and 4 of article 27 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 18 April 1961, the Government of Japan believes that the protection of diplomatic correspondence by means of diplomatic bags constitutes an important element of the Convention, and any reservation intended to allow a receiving State to open diplomatic bags without the consent of the sending State is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. Therefore the Government of Japan does not regard as valid the reservations concerning article 27 of the Convention made by the Government of Bahrain and the Government of Qatar on 2 November 1971 and 6 June 1986, respectively. The Government of Japan also desires to record that the above-stated position is applicable to any reservations to the same effect to be made in the future by other countries."

LUXEMBOURG

18 January 1965

With reference to the reservation and declaration made by the Governments of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics upon ratification of the Convention, the Government of Luxembourg regrets that it cannot accept that reservation or that declaration which tends to modify the effect of certain provisions of the Convention.

25 October 1965

With reference to the statement made by the Government of Hungary upon ratification of the Convention, the Government of Luxembourg regrets that it cannot accept this declaration.

MALTA

"The Government of Malta does not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 made by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph."

MONGOLIA

18 January 1978

"Reservation made by the Government of Bahrain to paragraph 3, article 27 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations is incompatible with the very object and purpose of the Convention. Therefore the

Government of the Mongolian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the above-mentioned reservation.

"The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic does not recognize the validity of the reservation made by the Government of the People's Republic of China to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations."

NETHERLANDS

"1. The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not accept the declarations by the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen concerning article 11, paragraph 1, of the Convention. The Kingdom of the Netherlands takes the view that this provision remains in force in relations between it and the said States in accordance with international customary law.

"2. The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not accept the declaration by the State of Bahrain concerning article 27, para- graph 3 of the Convention. It takes the view that this provision remains in force in relations between it and the State of Bahrain in accordance with international customary law. The Kingdom of the Netherlands is nevertheless prepared to agree to the following arrangement on a basis of reciprocity: If the authorities of the receiving state have serious grounds for supposing that the diplomatic bag contains something which pursuant to article 27, paragraph 4 of the Convention may not be sent in the diplomatic bag, they may demand that the bag be opened in the presence of the representative of the diplomat mission concerned. If the authorities of the sending state refuse to comply with such a request, the diplomatic bag shall be sent back to the place of origin.

"3. The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not accept the declarations by the Arab Republic of Egypt, the Khmer Republic, the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Republic of Malta and the Kingdom of Morocco concerning article 37, paragraph 2 of the Convention. It takes the view that these provisions remain in force in relations between it and the said States in accordance with international customary law."

5 December 1986

The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not accept both reser- vations made by the State of Qatar concerning article 27, para- graph 3, of the Convention. It takes the view that this provision remains in force in relations between it and the State of Qatar in accordance with international customary law. The Kingdom of the Netherlands is nevertheless prepared to agree to the following arrangement on a basis of reciprocity: If the authorities of the receiving State have serious grounds for believing that the diplomatic bag contains something which, pursuant to article 27, paragraph 4, of the Convention, may not be sent in the diplomatic bag, they may demand that the bag be opened in the presence of the representative of the diplomatic mission concerned. If the authorities of the sending State refuse to comply with such a demand, the diplomatic bag shall be sent back to the place of origin.

Furthermore, the Kingdom of the Netherlands does not accept the reservation made by the State of Qatar concerning article 37, paragraph 2, of the Convention. It takes the view that this provision remains in force in relations between it and the State of Qatar in accordance with international customary law.

Moreover, the Kingdom of the Netherlands does not accept the reservation made by the Yemen Arab Republic concerning article 37, paragraph 2, of the Convention. It takes the view that these provisions remain in force in relations between it and the Yemen Arab Republic in accordance with international customary law.

NEW ZEALAND

"The Government of New Zealand does not regard the state- ments concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph. Further, the Government of New Zealand does not accept the reservation to paragraph 2 of Article 37 of the Convention made by Cambodia, Morocco, Portugal and the United Arab Republic."

25 January 1977

"The Government of New Zealand does not regard as valid the reservations to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 18 April 1961 made by the Government of the People's Republic of China and considers that those paragraphs are in force between New Zealand and the People's Republic of China."

POLAND

3 November 1975

"The reservation made by the Government of Bahrain to article 27, paragraph 3 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, done at Vienna on 18 April 1961, is not compatible with the object and purpose of this Convention. It is contrary to fundamental principles of diplomatic international law. Therefore, the Polish People's Republic does not recognize this reser- vation as valid."

7 March 1978

"The principles of inviolability of diplomatic pouch and freedom of communication are generally recognized in interna- tional law and cannot be changed by unilateral reservation.

"This objection does not prevent entry into force of the Convention as between the Polish People's Republic and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

6 June 1972

With respect to the reservation made by Bahrain to article 27 (3):

... This reservation is contrary to the principle of the inviol- ability of the diplomatic bag, which is recognized in international practice, and is therefore unacceptable.

11 October 1977

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not recognize the validity of the reservation expressed by the People's Republic of China concerning paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961.

7 November 1977

"The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the reservation made by the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya concerning article 27 of the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations."

16 February 1982

"The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not recognize the validity of the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia on its accession to the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, since that reservation is contrary to one of the most important provisions of the Convention, namely, that the diplomatic bag shall not be opened or detained."

6 October 1986

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not recognize as valid the reservations of the Government of Qatar with respect to article 27, paragraph 3 and article 37, paragraph 2 of the 1961 Convention on Diplomatic Relations. The Government of the USSR considers that the reservations in question are illegal, since they conflict with the purposes of the Convention.

6 November 1986

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not recognize as lawful the reservations of the Government of Yemen with respect to articles 27, 36 and 37 of the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, since those reservations conflict with the purposes of the Convention.

SLOVAKIA[5]

THAILAND

"1. The Government of the Kingdom of Thailand does not regard the statements concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention made by the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph.

2. The Government of the Kingdom of Thailand does not regard as valid the reservation made by the State of Bahrain in respect of paragraph 3 of article 27 of the Convention.

3. The Government of the Kingdom of Thailand does not regard as valid the reservations and declarations with respect to paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Convention made by Democratic Kampuchea, the Arab Republic of Egypt and the Kingdom of Morocco.

The foregoing objections shall not, however, be regarded as preventing the entry into force of the Convention as between Thailand and the above-mentioned countries."

TONGA

In its notification of succession, the Government of Tonga has indicated that it adopts the objections made by the United Kingdom respecting the reservations and statements made by Egypt, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mongolia, Bulgaria, the Khmer Republic, Morocco and Portugal, when ratifying (or acceding to) the said Convention on Diplomatic Relations.

UKRAINE

28 July 1972

The reservation made by the Government of Bahrain to the above-mentioned Convention is contrary to the principle of the inviolability of the diplomatic bag, which is generally recognized in international practice, and is therefore unacceptable to the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

24 October 1977

"The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not recognize as valid the reservation to article 37, paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the People's Republic of China."

20 October 1986

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis,as the one made by the Russian Federation on 6 October1986.]

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

1 September 1964

"The Government of the United Kingdom do not regard as valid the reservation to paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the United Arab Republic. Further, the Government of the United Kingdom do not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention made by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph."

7 June 1967

"The Government of the United Kingdom do not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention made by the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph."

29 March 1968

"The Government of the United Kingdom do not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention made by the Government of Bulgaria as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph."

19 June 1968

"The Government of the United Kingdom do not regard as valid the reservation to paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the Government of Cambodia."

23 August 1968

"The Government of the United Kingdom do not regard as valid the reservation to paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the Kingdom of Morocco."

10 December 1968

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland do not regard as valid the reservation to paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the Government of Portugal."

13 March 1973

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wish to put on record that they do not regard as valid the reservation to paragraph 3 of Article 27 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the Government of Bahrain."

16 April 1973

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wish to place on record that they do not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of Article 11 of the Convention made by the German Democratic Republic, in a letter accompanying the instrument of accession, as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph."

25 January 1977

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland do not regard as valid the reservations to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the People's Republic of China".

4 February 1977

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wish to place on record that they do not re- gard the reservation concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention, made by the Government of Democratic Yemen, as modifying any rights or obligations under that paragraph."

19 February 1987

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wish to place on record that they do not regard as valid the reservations to paragraph 3 of article 27, and to paragraph 2 of article 37, of the Vienna Convention on Diplo- matic Relations made by the Government of the State of Qatar."

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

22 June 1964

"The Government of the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar rejects formally the reservation to article 11, paragraph 1, of the Convention made by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in its instrument of ratification."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2 July 1974

"The Government of the United States of America ... states its objection to reservations with respect to paragraph 3 of article 27 by Bahrain; with respect to paragraph 4 of article 27 by Kuwait; with respect to paragraph 2 of article 37 by the United Arab Republic (now the Arab Republic of Egypt), by Cambodia (now the Khmer Republic) and by Morocco, respectively. The Government of the United States, however, considers the Con- vention as continuing in force between it and the respective above-mentioned States except for the provisions to which the reservations are addressed in each case."

4 September 1987

"The Government of the United States of America wishes to state its objections to the reservations regarding the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made with respect to paragraph 4 of Article 27 by the Yemen Arab Republic and with respect to paragraph 3 of Article 27 and paragraph 2 of Article 37 by the State of Qatar, respectively.

...

The Government of the United States, however, considers the [Convention] as continuing in force between it and the respective above-mentioned States except for the provisions to which the reservations are addressed in each case."

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 18 April 1961 and 1 April 1963, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] See note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portugal" regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] Signed and ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 18 April 1961 and 19 December 1969, respectively. See also note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned signature and/or ratification, the Permanent Representatives of the Permanent Missions to the United of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Mongolia, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that their Governments considered the said signature and/or ratification as null and void, since the so-called "Government of China" had no right to speak or assume obligations on behalf of China, there being only one Chinese State, the People's Republic of China, and one Government entitled to represent it, the Government of the People's Republic of China.

In letters addressed to the Secretary-General in regard to the above-mentioned communications, the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations stated that the Republic of China, a sovereign State and Member of the United Nations, had attended the 1961 Conference on Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities, contributed to the formulation of the Convention concerned, signed the Convention and duly deposited the instrument of ratification thereof, and that "any statements and reservations relating to the above-mentioned Convention that are incompatible with or derogatory to the legitimate position of the Government of the Republic of China shall in no way affect the rights and obligations of the Republic of China under this Convention".

The instrument of accession deposited on behalf of the Government of China on 25 November 1975 contained the following declaration:

The "signature" on and "ratification" of this Convention by the Chiang Kai-shek clique usurping the name of China are illegal and null and void.

[5] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 18 April 1961 and 24 May 1963, respectively.

Subsequently, the Government of Czechoslovakia communicated objections to various reservations and declarations. For the text of the objections, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 808, p. 388; vol. 1057, p. 330 and vol. 1060, p. 347.

On 1 June 1987, the Government of Czechoslovakia communicated the following objections:

With regard to the reservations made by Yemen concerning articles 27, 36 and 37:

"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic regards the reservations of the Yemen Arab Republic with respect to articles 27, 36 and 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of April 18, 1961 as incompatible with the objects and purposes of this Convention. Therefore, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not recognize these reservations as valid."

With regard to reservations made by Qatar concerning article 27, paragraph 3 and article 37, paragraph 2:

"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic regards the reservations of the State of Qatar with respect to article 27, paragraph 3 and article 37, paragraph 2 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of April 18, 1961 as incompatible with the objects and purposes of this Convention. Therefore, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not recognize these reservations as valid."

See also note 1 under “Czech Republic” and note 1 under “Slovakia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 23 February 1973 with a reservation and a declaration. For the text of the reservation and declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 856, p. 231. See also note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under “Germany” regarding Berlin (West) in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] In its notification of succession, the Government of Malta indicated that it considers itself bound by the Convention as from 1 October 1964 [the date of entry into force of the Convention for the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland].

[9] See note 1 under “Montenegro” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 1 under “Netherlands” regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[11] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[12] In communications addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned ratification, the Permanent Mission of Bulgaria and the Permanent Representative of Romania to the United Nations, stated that their Governments considered the said ratification as null and void for the South Korean authorities could not speak on behalf of Korea.

Subsequently, in a communication addressed to the Secretary-General concerning the communication made by the Permanent Representative of Romania, the Permanent Observer of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations stated the following:

"The Republic of Korea took part in the United Nations Conference on Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities, and contributed to the formulation of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, done at Vienna on 18 April 1961, signed the Convention on the same day and duly deposited the instrument of ratification thereof with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 28 December 1970.

"As the resolution 195 (III) of the General Assembly of the United Nations dated 12 December 1948 declares unmistakably, the Government of the Republic of Korea is the only lawful government in Korea.

"Therefore, the rights and obligations of the Republic of Korea under the said Convention shall in no way be affected by any statement that has no basis in fact or unjustly distorts the legitimacy of the Government of the Republic of Korea."

Further, on 13 March 2002, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Romania the following communication:

"The Permanent Mission of Romania to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General of the United

Nations and has the honour to present the position of the Romanian Government concerning its communication following the deposit of the instrument of ratification of the Convention on Diplomatic Relations (Vienna, the 18th of April 1961) by the Republic of Korea, on the 28th of December 1970, which stated that this ratificationnull and void.

Romania and the Republic of Korea have established diplomatic relations by signing a Protocol on the 31st of March 1990 and, therefore, the two States have been developing diplomatic relations on the basis of respect of the international law, including the relevant provisions of the Vienna Convention.

In the new historical context, the communication mentioned above became obsolete."

Moreover, in a communication received on 24 October 2002, the Government of Bulgaria informed the Secretary-General of the following:

"[U]pon ratification of the Convention by the Republic of Korea, in 1971 the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria[,] in [a] communication addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned ratification, ... stated that its Government considered the said ratification as null and void for the South Korean authorities could not speak on behalf of Korea.

Now therefore [the Government of the Republic of Bulgaria declares] that the Government of the Republic of Bulgaria, having reviewed the said declaration, hereby withdraws the same."

[13] In a communication accompanying the notification of succession, the Government of Tuvalu declared that it had decided not to succeed to the Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, done at Vienna on 18 April 1961, and that pursuant to Tuvalu's declaration, dated 19 December 1978, regarding treaties applied before independence, the application of the Optional Protocol to Tuvalu should be regarded as terminated as at 1 September 1982.

[14] The Republic of Viet-Nam had acceded to the Convention on 10 May 1973. See also note 1 under "Viet Nam" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[15] The Yemen Arab Republic had acceded to the Convention on 10 April 1986 with the following reservations:

1. The accession of the Yemen Arab Republic to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, done at Vienna on 18 April 1961, in no way implies recognition of Israel and shall not entail the entry of the Yemen Arab Republic with Israel into any of the relations governed by this Convention.

2. The Yemen Arab Republic has the right to inspect foodstuffs imported by diplomatic envoys and diplomatic missions in order to ascertain that they conform in quantity and in kind to the list submitted by them to the customs authorities and to the Office of Protocol at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the purpose of obtaining approval for their importation exempt from customs duties in accordance with article 36 of the Convention.

3. Where there are serious and strong grounds for believing that the diplomatic bag contains articles or substances not mentioned in article 27, paragraph 4, of the Convention, the Yemen Arab Republic reserves its right to request that the bag be opened in the presence of a representative of the embassy concerned. If the embassy refuses to comply with this request, the bag shall be returned to its place of origin.

4. Reservation concerning the privileges and immunities provided for in article 37, paragraph 2, of the Convention in respect of members of the administrative and technical staff of the mission: the Yemen Arab Republic shall not be bound to implement this paragraph except on a basis of reciprocity.

See aslo note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[16] In a communication received on 16 October 1985, the Government of Zambia specified that upon succession, it had not wished to maintain the objections made by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland with respect to articles 11 (1), 27 (3) and 37 (2).

[17] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 5 September 1969, the Government of Israel declared that it "has noted the political character of the declaration made by the Government of Kuwait on acceding to the above Convention. In the view of the Govern- ment of Israel, this Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Kuwait an attitude of complete reciprocity".

Identical communications, in essence, *mutatis mutandis* , were received by the Secretary-General from the Government of Israel on 15 October 1969 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by Egypt (see also note 20 in this chapter and note 1 under "United Arab Republic" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume), on 6 January 1972 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by Bahrain, on 12 January 1977 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by Democratic Yemen, on 30 August 1977 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, on 29 October 1979 in respect of the declaration made on 15 March 1979 by the Syrian Arab Republic, on 1 April 1981 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by Saudi Arabia, on 14 August 1981 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by Sudan, on 15 October 1986 in respect of the reservation made upon accession by Qatar, and on 1 September 1987 in respect of the reservation made upon accession by Yemen.

[18] In a communication received on 15 September 1980, the Government of China notified the Secretary-General that it withdraws its reservations with regard to article 37, paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of the Convention.

[19] Upon ratification of the Convention, the Government of Ecuador withdrew the reservation to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the Convention formulated at the time of its signature.

[20] In a notification received on 18 January 1980, the Government of Egypt informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation relating to Israel, made upon

accession. The notification indicates 25 January 1980 as the effective date of the withdrawal. For the text of that reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 500, p. 211.

[21] In a letter accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of Greece notified the Secretary-General that it did not main- tain the reservation made at the time of signature of the Convention, to the effect that the last sentence of paragraph 2 of article 37 would not apply. (See United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 500, p. 186.)

[22] In a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with regard to article 11, paragraph 1. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 587, p. 352.

[23] In a communication received on 1 June 1972, the Government of Portugal notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Convention, made upon accession. For the text of that reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 645, p. 372.

[24] These reservations were not included in the instrument of accession deposited on behalf of the Syrian Arab Republic on 4 August 1978. In accordance with the practice followed by the Secretary-General in similar circumstances, the text of the reservations was communicated to the States concerned on 2 April 1979, and, since no objections to this procedure were received within 90 days from that date, the Secretary-General received the said notification of reservation in definitive deposit on 1 July 1979. For the objection as to the substance formulated by the Federal Republic of Germany in respect of reservation No. 3, see under ***"Objections"*** . It should be noted that, as at the date of receipt of the said declaration the Syrian Arab Republic had become neither a party nor a signatory to the Optional Protocol concerning the settlement of disputes.

[25] In the instrument of ratification, the Government of Venezuela confirmed the reservation set forth in paragraph 3 of its reservations made upon signature. On depositing the instrument of ratification, the Permanent Representative of Venezuela to the United Nations stated that the reservations set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2 had not been main- tained by the Government of Venezuela upon ratification and should be considered as withdrawn; for the text of those reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 500, p. 202.

[26] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 8 June 1977, the Government of the Bahamas declared that it wishes to maintain the objections made by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland prior to the independence of the Bahamas. (For the text of the objections made by the Government of the United Kingdom prior to 10 July 1973, the date when the Bahamas acceded to independence, see under " ***Objections*** " .)

4. Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, concerning Acquisition of Nationality

Vienna, 18 April 1961

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 April 1964, in accordance with article VI.
REGISTRATION: 24 June 1964, No. 7311.
STATUS: Signatories: 19. Parties: 51.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 500, p. 223.

Note: See *"Note:"* in chapter III.3.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Argentina	25 Oct 1961	10 Oct 1963
Belgium		2 May 1968 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1]		12 Jan 1994 d
Botswana		11 Apr 1969 a
Cambodia		31 Aug 1965 a
Central African Republic	28 Mar 1962	19 Mar 1973
China[2]	18 Apr 1961	
Democratic Republic of the Congo		15 Jul 1976 a
Denmark	18 Apr 1961	2 Oct 1968
Dominican Republic	30 Mar 1962	14 Jan 1964
Egypt		9 Jun 1964 a
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Finland	20 Oct 1961	9 Dec 1969
Gabon		2 Apr 1964 a
Germany[3,4]	28 Mar 1962	11 Nov 1964
Ghana	18 Apr 1961	
Guinea		10 Jan 1968 a
Iceland		18 May 1971 a
India		15 Oct 1965 a
Indonesia		4 Jun 1982 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	27 May 1961	3 Feb 1965
Iraq	20 Feb 1962	15 Oct 1963
Italy	13 Mar 1962	25 Jun 1969
Kenya		1 Jul 1965 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		3 Dec 1962 a
Lebanon	18 Apr 1961	
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		7 Jun 1977 a
Madagascar		31 Jul 1963 a
Malawi		29 Apr 1980 a
Malaysia		9 Nov 1965 a
Montenegro[5]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		23 Feb 1977 a
Myanmar		7 Mar 1980 a
Nepal		28 Sep 1965 a
Netherlands[6]		7 Sep 1984 a
New Zealand[7]		5 Sep 2003 a
Nicaragua		9 Jan 1990 a
Niger		28 Mar 1966 a
Norway	18 Apr 1961	24 Oct 1967
Oman		31 May 1974 a
Panama		4 Dec 1963 a
Paraguay		23 Dec 1969 a
Philippines	20 Oct 1961	15 Nov 1965
Republic of Korea	30 Mar 1962	7 Mar 1977
Senegal	18 Apr 1961	
Serbia[1]		12 Mar 2001 d
Sri Lanka		31 Jul 1978 a
Suriname		28 Oct 1992 a
Sweden	18 Apr 1961	21 Mar 1967
Switzerland		12 Jun 1992 a
Thailand	30 Oct 1961	23 Jan 1985
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1]		18 Aug 1993 d
Tunisia		24 Jan 1968 a
United Republic of Tanzania	27 Feb 1962	5 Nov 1962

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands interprets the words "not, solely by the operation of the law of the receiving State" in article II of the Optional Protocol concerning Acquisition of Nationality as meaning that acquisition of nationality by descent is not regarded as acquisition of nationality solely by the operation of this law."

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

THAILAND

[See chapter III.3.]

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 18 April 1961 and 1 April 1963, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 18 April 1961. See also note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned signature and/or ratification, the Permanent Representatives of the Permanent Missions to the United of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Mongolia, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that their Governments considered the said signature and/or ratification as null and void, since the so-called "Government of China" had no right to speak or assume obligations on behalf of China, there being only one Chinese State, the People's Republic of China, and one Government entitled to represent it, the Government of the People's Republic of China.

In letters addressed to the Secretary-General in regard to the above-mentioned communications, the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations stated that the Republic of China, a sovereign State and Member of the United Nations, had attended the 1961 Conference on Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities, contributed to the formulation of the Convention concerned, signed the Convention and duly deposited the instrument of ratification thereof, and that "any statements and reservations relating to the above-mentioned Convention that are incompatible with or derogatory to the legitimate position of the Government of the Republic of China shall in no way affect the rights and obligations of the Republic of China under this Convention".

The instrument of accession deposited on behalf of the Government of China on 25 November 1975 contained the following declaration:

The "signature" on and "ratification" of this Convention by the Chiang Kai-shek clique usurping the name of China are illegal and null and void.

[3] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] With a territorial exclusion in respect of the Tokelau Islands:

"Declares that, consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand to the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, this accession shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory."

5. OPTIONAL PROTOCOL TO THE VIENNA CONVENTION ON DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS, CONCERNING THE COMPULSORY SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

Vienna, 18 April 1961

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 April 1964, in accordance with article VIII.
REGISTRATION: 24 June 1964, No. 7312.
STATUS: Signatories: 30. Parties: 66.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 500, p. 241.

Note: See *"Note:"* in chapter III.3.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Australia		26 Jan 1968 a
Austria	18 Apr 1961	28 Apr 1966
Bahamas		17 Mar 1977 a
Belgium	23 Oct 1961	2 May 1968
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1]		1 Sep 1993 d
Botswana		11 Apr 1969 a
Bulgaria		6 Jun 1989 a
Cambodia		31 Aug 1965 a
Central African Republic	28 Mar 1962	19 Mar 1973
China[2]	18 Apr 1961	
Colombia	18 Apr 1961	
Costa Rica		9 Nov 1964 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo		19 Jul 1965 a
Denmark	18 Apr 1961	2 Oct 1968
Dominica		24 Mar 2006 a
Dominican Republic	30 Mar 1962	13 Feb 1964
Ecuador	18 Apr 1961	21 Sep 1964
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Fiji		21 Jun 1971 d
Finland	20 Oct 1961	9 Dec 1969
France	30 Mar 1962	31 Dec 1970
Gabon		2 Apr 1964 a
Germany[3,4]	18 Apr 1961	11 Nov 1964
Ghana	18 Apr 1961	
Guinea		10 Jan 1968 a
Hungary		8 Dec 1989 a
Iceland		18 May 1971 a
India		15 Oct 1965 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	27 May 1961	3 Feb 1965
Iraq	20 Feb 1962	15 Oct 1963
Ireland	18 Apr 1961	
Israel	18 Apr 1961	
Italy	13 Mar 1962	25 Jun 1969
Japan	26 Mar 1962	8 Jun 1964
Kenya		1 Jul 1965 a
Kuwait		21 Feb 1991 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		3 Dec 1962 a
Lebanon	18 Apr 1961	
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Liechtenstein	18 Apr 1961	8 May 1964
Luxembourg	2 Feb 1962	17 Aug 1966
Madagascar		31 Jul 1963 a
Malawi		29 Apr 1980 a
Malaysia		9 Nov 1965 a
Malta[5]		7 Mar 1967 d
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 d
Montenegro[6]		23 Oct 2006 d
Nepal		28 Sep 1965 a
Netherlands[7]		7 Sep 1984 a
New Zealand[8]	28 Mar 1962	23 Sep 1970
Nicaragua		9 Jan 1990 a
Niger		26 Apr 1966 a
Norway	18 Apr 1961	24 Oct 1967
Oman		31 May 1974 a
Pakistan		29 Mar 1976 a
Panama		4 Dec 1963 a
Paraguay		23 Dec 1969 a
Philippines	20 Oct 1961	15 Nov 1965
Republic of Korea	30 Mar 1962	25 Jan 1977
Romania		19 Sep 2007 a
Serbia[1]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		29 May 1979 a
Slovakia		27 Apr 1999 a
Slovenia[1]		6 Jul 1992 d

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Sri Lanka		31 Jul 1978 a
Suriname		28 Oct 1992 a
Sweden	18 Apr 1961	21 Mar 1967
Switzerland	18 Apr 1961	22 Nov 1963
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1,9]		18 Aug 1993 d
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	11 Dec 1961	1 Sep 1964
United Republic of Tanzania	27 Feb 1962	5 Nov 1962
United States of America	29 Jun 1961	13 Nov 1972

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Optional Protocol on 18 April 1961 and 1 April 1963, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 18 April 1961. See also note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned signature and/or ratification, the Permanent Representatives of the Permanent Missions to the United of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Mongolia, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that their Governments considered the said signature and/or ratification as null and void, since the so-called "Government of China" had no right to speak or assume obligations on behalf of China, there being only one Chinese State, the People's Republic of China, and one Government entitled to represent it, the Government of the People's Republic of China.

In letters addressed to the Secretary-General in regard to the above-mentioned communications, the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations stated that the Republic of China, a sovereign State and Member of the United Nations, had attended the 1961 Conference on Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities, contributed to the formulation of the Convention concerned, signed the Convention and duly deposited the instrument of ratification thereof, and that "any statements and reservations relating to the above-mentioned Convention that are incompatible with or derogatory to the legitimate position of the Government of the Republic of China shall in no way affect the rights and obligations of the Republic of China under this Convention".

The instrument of accession deposited on behalf of the Government of China on 25 November 1975 contained the following declaration:

The "signature" on and "ratification" of this Convention by the Chiang Kai-shek clique usurping the name of China are illegal and null and void.

[3] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In a communication received on 22 March 1965, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany informed the Secretary-General of the following:

"The Federal Republic of Germany is not a Party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice. In order to meet her obligations under article I of the Optional Protocol on the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, and in accordance with Security Council resolution of 15 October 1946 on the conditions under which the International Court of Justice shall be open to States not Parties to that Statute [resolution 9 (1946) adopted by the Security Council at its 76th meeting], the Federal Republic has issued a declaration accepting the competence of the International Court of Justice for the disputes named in article I of the Optional Protocol on the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes. This declaration also applies to the disputes named in article IV of the Optional Protocol on the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes which arise from the interpretation or application of the Optional Protocol on the Acquisition of Nationality."

The declaration referred to above was deposited by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on 29 January 1965 with the Registrar of the International Court of Justice who transmitted certified true copies thereof to all States parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with paragraph 3 of the Security Council resolution referred to above.

In the same communication, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has notified the Secretary-General, in accordance with article IV of the Optional Protocol concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, done at Vienna on 18 April 1961, that it will extend the provisions of the said Protocol to disputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the Optional Protocol concerning the Acquisition of Nationality, done at Vienna on 18 April 1961.

See also note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) iHistorical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] In its notification of succession the Government of Malta indicated that it considers itself bound by the Convention as from 1 October 1964 [the date of entry into force of the

Convention for the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland].

[6] See note 1 under “Montenegro” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 1 under “Netherlands” regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] Upon depositing the notification of succession, the Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia declared that "... the stipulation contained in this Protocol also apply to differences that arose from the interpretation or implementation of the Protocol with facultative signing relating to the acquisition of citizenship".

6. VIENNA CONVENTION ON CONSULAR RELATIONS

Vienna, 24 April 1963

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 19 March 1967, in accordance with article 77.
REGISTRATION: 8 June 1967, No. 8638.
STATUS: Signatories: 48. Parties: 172.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 596, p. 261.

Note: The Convention was adopted on 22 April 1963 by the United Nations Conference on Consular Relations held at the Neue Hofburg in Vienna, Austria, from 4 March to 22 April 1963. The Conference also adopted the Optional Protocol concerning Acquisition of Nationality, the Optional Protocol concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, the Final Act and three resolutions annexed to that Act. The Convention and the two Protocols were deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The Final Act, by unanimous decision of the Conference, was deposited in the archives of the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Austria. For the proceedings of the Conference, see *United Nations Conference on Consular Relations, Official Records, vols. I and II* (United Nations publication, Sales Nos.: 63.X.2 and 64.X.1). The text of the Convention, two Protocols, Final Act and resolutions is published in vol. II.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Albania		4 Oct 1991 a
Algeria		14 Apr 1964 a
Andorra		3 Jul 1996 a
Angola		21 Nov 1990 a
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 d
Argentina	24 Apr 1963	7 Mar 1967
Armenia		23 Jun 1993 a
Australia	31 Mar 1964	12 Feb 1973
Austria	24 Apr 1963	12 Jun 1969
Azerbaijan		13 Aug 1992 a
Bahamas		17 Mar 1977 d
Bahrain		17 Sep 1992 a
Bangladesh		13 Jan 1978 d
Barbados		11 May 1992 a
Belarus		21 Mar 1989 a
Belgium	31 Mar 1964	9 Sep 1970
Belize		30 Nov 2000 a
Benin	24 Apr 1963	27 Apr 1979
Bhutan		28 Jul 1981 a
Bolivia	6 Aug 1963	22 Sep 1970
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1]		1 Sep 1993 d
Botswana		26 Mar 2008 a
Brazil	24 Apr 1963	11 May 1967
Bulgaria		11 Jul 1989 a
Burkina Faso	24 Apr 1963	11 Aug 1964
Cambodia		10 Mar 2006 a
Cameroon	21 Aug 1963	22 May 1967
Canada		18 Jul 1974 a
Cape Verde		30 Jul 1979 a

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Central African Republic	24 Apr 1963	
Chile	24 Apr 1963	9 Jan 1968
China[2,3,4]		2 Jul 1979 a
Colombia	24 Apr 1963	6 Sep 1972
Congo	24 Apr 1963	
Costa Rica	6 Jun 1963	29 Dec 1966
Côte d'Ivoire	24 Apr 1963	
Croatia[1]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba	24 Apr 1963	15 Oct 1965
Cyprus		14 Apr 1976 a
Czech Republic[5]		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		8 Aug 1984 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo	24 Apr 1963	15 Jul 1976
Denmark	24 Apr 1963	15 Nov 1972
Djibouti		2 Nov 1978 a
Dominica		24 Nov 1987 d
Dominican Republic	24 Apr 1963	4 Mar 1964
Ecuador	25 Mar 1964	11 Mar 1965
Egypt		21 Jun 1965 a
El Salvador		19 Jan 1973 a
Equatorial Guinea		30 Aug 1976 a
Eritrea		14 Jan 1997 a
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Fiji		28 Apr 1972 a
Finland	28 Oct 1963	2 Jul 1980
France	24 Apr 1963	31 Dec 1970
Gabon	24 Apr 1963	23 Feb 1965

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Georgia		12 Jul 1993 a
Germany[6,7]	31 Oct 1963	7 Sep 1971
Ghana	24 Apr 1963	4 Oct 1963
Greece		14 Oct 1975 a
Grenada		2 Sep 1992 a
Guatemala		9 Feb 1973 a
Guinea		30 Jun 1988 a
Guyana		13 Sep 1973 a
Haiti		2 Feb 1978 a
Holy See	24 Apr 1963	8 Oct 1970
Honduras		13 Feb 1968 a
Hungary		19 Jun 1987 a
Iceland		1 Jun 1978 a
India		28 Nov 1977 a
Indonesia		4 Jun 1982 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	24 Apr 1963	5 Jun 1975
Iraq		14 Jan 1970 a
Ireland	24 Apr 1963	10 May 1967
Israel	25 Feb 1964	
Italy	22 Nov 1963	25 Jun 1969
Jamaica		9 Feb 1976 a
Japan		3 Oct 1983 a
Jordan		7 Mar 1973 a
Kazakhstan		5 Jan 1994 a
Kenya		1 Jul 1965 a
Kiribati		2 Apr 1982 d
Kuwait	10 Jan 1964	31 Jul 1975
Kyrgyzstan		7 Oct 1994 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		9 Aug 1973 a
Latvia		13 Feb 1992 a
Lebanon	24 Apr 1963	20 Mar 1975
Lesotho		26 Jul 1972 a
Liberia	24 Apr 1963	28 Aug 1984
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		4 Sep 1998 a
Liechtenstein	24 Apr 1963	18 May 1966
Lithuania		15 Jan 1992 a
Luxembourg	24 Mar 1964	8 Mar 1972
Madagascar		17 Feb 1967 a
Malawi		29 Apr 1980 a
Malaysia		1 Oct 1991 a
Maldives		21 Jan 1991 a
Mali		28 Mar 1968 a
Malta		10 Dec 1997 a
Marshall Islands		9 Aug 1991 a
Mauritania		21 Jul 2000 a
Mauritius		13 May 1970 a
Mexico	7 Oct 1963	16 Jun 1965
Micronesia (Federated States of)		29 Apr 1991 a
Moldova		26 Jan 1993 a
Monaco		4 Oct 2005 a
Mongolia		14 Mar 1989 a
Montenegro[8]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		23 Feb 1977 a
Mozambique		18 Apr 1983 a
Myanmar		2 Jan 1997 a
Namibia		14 Sep 1992 a
Nepal		28 Sep 1965 a
Netherlands[9]		17 Dec 1985 a
New Zealand[10]		10 Sep 1974 a
Nicaragua		31 Oct 1975 a
Niger	24 Apr 1963	26 Apr 1966
Nigeria		22 Jan 1968 a
Norway	24 Apr 1963	13 Feb 1980
Oman		31 May 1974 a
Pakistan		14 Apr 1969 a
Panama	4 Dec 1963	28 Aug 1967
Papua New Guinea		4 Dec 1975 d
Paraguay		23 Dec 1969 a
Peru	24 Apr 1963	17 Feb 1978
Philippines	24 Apr 1963	15 Nov 1965
Poland	20 Mar 1964	13 Oct 1981
Portugal[4]		13 Sep 1972 a
Qatar		4 Nov 1998 a
Republic of Korea		7 Mar 1977 a
Romania		24 Feb 1972 a
Russian Federation		15 Mar 1989 a
Rwanda		31 May 1974 a
Saint Lucia		27 Aug 1986 d
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		27 Apr 1999 d
Samoa		26 Oct 1987 a
Sao Tome and Principe		3 May 1983 a
Saudi Arabia		29 Jun 1988 a
Senegal		29 Apr 1966 a
Serbia[1]		12 Mar 2001 d

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)
Seychelles		29 May 1979 a
Singapore		1 Apr 2005 a
Slovakia[5]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[1]		6 Jul 1992 d
Somalia		29 Mar 1968 a
South Africa		21 Aug 1989 a
Spain		3 Feb 1970 a
Sri Lanka		4 May 2006 a
Sudan		23 Mar 1995 a
Suriname		11 Sep 1980 a
Sweden	8 Oct 1963	19 Mar 1974
Switzerland	23 Oct 1963	3 May 1965
Syrian Arab Republic		13 Oct 1978 a
Tajikistan		6 May 1996 a
Thailand		15 Apr 1999 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1,11]		18 Aug 1993 d
Timor-Leste		30 Jan 2004 a
Togo		26 Sep 1983 a
Tonga		7 Jan 1972 a
Trinidad and Tobago		19 Oct 1965 a
Tunisia		8 Jul 1964 a
Turkey		19 Feb 1976 a
Turkmenistan		25 Sep 1996 a
Tuvalu[12]		15 Sep 1982 d
Ukraine		27 Apr 1989 a
United Arab Emirates		24 Feb 1977 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[2,13]	27 Mar 1964	9 May 1972
United Republic of Tanzania		18 Apr 1977 a
United States of America	24 Apr 1963	24 Nov 1969
Uruguay	24 Apr 1963	10 Mar 1970
Uzbekistan		2 Mar 1992 a
Vanuatu		18 Aug 1987 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)[14]	24 Apr 1963	27 Oct 1965
Viet Nam[15]		8 Sep 1992 a
Yemen[16]		10 Apr 1986 a
Zimbabwe		13 May 1991 a

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto see hereinafter.)

BAHRAIN

Declaration:

"The accession by the State of Bahrain to the said Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith."

BARBADOS

Declaration:

"The Government of Barbados hereby declares that it will interpret the exemption accorded to members of a consular post by paragraph 3 of article 44 from liability to give evidence concerning matters connected with the exercise of their functions as relating only to Acts in respect of which consular officers and consular employees enjoy immunity from the jurisdiction of the juridical or administrative authorities of the receiving state in accordance with the provisions of article 43 of the Convention."

BELIZE

Declaration:

"The Government of Belize will interpret the exemption accorded to members of a consular post by paragraph 3 of Article 44 from liability to give evidence concerning matters connected with the exercise of their functions as relating only to acts in respect of which consular officers and consular employees enjoy immunity from the jurisdiction of the judicial or administrative authorities of the receiving State in accordance with the provisions of Article 43 of the Convention. The Government of Belize further declares that it will interpret Chapter II of the Convention as applying to all career consular employees, including those employed at a consular post headed by an honorary consular officer."

BULGARIA

Declaration:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that referring to the provisions of article 31, paragraph 2 of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations the authorities of the receiving State may enter the consular premises in the event of fire or other disaster in the presence of a representative of the sending State or after all appropriate steps have been taken to obtain the consent of the head of the consular post.

CUBA

The Revolutionary Government of Cuba makes an express reservation to the provisions of articles 74 and 76 of the Convention because it considers that, in view of the nature of the content and rules of the Convention, all free and sovereign States have the right to participate in it, and the Revolutionary Government is therefore in favour of facilitating accession by all countries in the international community, without distinction as to the territorial size of States, the number of their inhabitants or their social, economic or political systems.

CZECH REPUBLIC[5]

DENMARK

In respect of article 5 (j), consular posts established in Denmark by foreign States may not, except by virtue of a special agreement, execute letters rogatory or commissions to take evidence for the courts of the sending State, and may transmit judicial and extra-judicial documents only in civil or commercial matters.

(1) "With reference to Article 22, the Government of Denmark expresses the wish that it may be possible to maintain the practice existing between Denmark and a number of other countries to appoint honorary consular officers from among persons having the nationality of the receiving State or of a third State; the Government of Denmark further expresses the hope that States with which Denmark establishes consular relations will give their consent, pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article 22, to the appointment of honorary consuls having the nationality of the receiving State or a third State.

(2) "With reference to Article 68, the Government of Denmark expresses its desire, in accordance with Danish practice, to continue appointing honorary consular officers and, on condition of reciprocity, its willingness to continue receiving honorary consular officers in Denmark."

EGYPT[17,18]

"..."

"2- Paragraph 1 of article 46 concerning exemption from registration of aliens and residence permits shall not apply to consular employees.

"3- Article 49 concerning exemption from taxation shall apply only to consular officers, their spouses and minor children. This exemption cannot be extended to consular employees and to members of the service staff.

"4- Article 62 concerning exemption from custom duties and taxes on articles for the official use of a consular post headed by an honorary officer, shall not apply.

"5- Article 65 is not accepted. Honorary consular officers cannot be exempted from registration of aliens and residence permits.

"6- It is the understanding of the United Arab Republic that the privileges and immunities specified in this Convention are granted only to consular officers, their spouses and minor children and cannot be extended to other members of their families."

FIJI

"Fiji will interpret the exemption accorded to members of a consular post by paragraph 3 of Article 44 from liability to give evidence concerning matters connected with the exercise of their functions as relating only to acts in respect of which consu- lar officers and consular employees enjoy immunity from the jurisdiction of the judicial or administrative authorities of the receiving State in accordance with the provisions of article 43 of the Convention."

FINLAND

Reservation:

"With regard to article 35, paragraph 1, and article 58, paragraph 1, Finland does not accord to consular posts headed by honorary consular officers the right to employ diplomatic or consular couriers and diplomatic or consular bags, or to governments, diplomatic missions and other consular posts the right to employ these means in communicating with consular posts headed by honorary consular officers, except to the extent that Finland may have consented thereto in particular cases."

Declarations:

"With reference to article 22 of the Convention, the Finnish Government expressed the wish that in countries where it has been an established practice to allow nationals of the receiving State or of a third State to be appointed as Finnish honorary consuls, this practice will continue to be allowed as before. The Finnish Government also expresses the hope that countries with which Finland establishes new consular relations will follow a similar practice and will give their consent to such appointments pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 22."

"With reference to article 49, paragraph 1 b, the Finnish Government wishes to add that, according to established practice, exemption cannot be granted in respect of dues or taxes levied on certain private movable property, such as shares or stock or other form of partnership in condominium or housing corporation entitling the holder of such movable property to possess and control immovable property situated in the territory of Finland and owned or otherwise legally possessed by the said condominium or housing corporation."

GERMANY[6,7]

8 April 1974

Declaration:

"The Federal Republic of Germany interprets the provisions of Chapter II of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, done on 24 April 1963, as applying to all career consular personnel (consular officers, consular employees and members of the service staff), including those assigned to a consular post headed by an honorary consular officer, and that it will apply the said provisions accordingly."

ICELAND

With reference to article 22 of the Convention, the Icelandic Government expresses the wish that in countries where it has been an established practice to allow nationals of the receiving State or of a third State to be appointed as Icelandic honorary consuls, this will continue to be allowed as before. The Icelandic Government also expresses the hope that countries with which Iceland establishes new consular relations will follow a similar practice and will give their consent to such appointments pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 22.

IRAQ[18]

The accession of the Republic of Iraq to this Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of the Member of the United Nations called Israel or imply any obligation toward or relation with the said Member.

ITALY

With reference to the provision contained in article 36, paragraph 1 (c), of the Convention on Consular Relations, the Italian Government considers that the right of a consular official to visit nationals of his State who are for any reason held in custody and to act on their behalf may not be waived, inasmuch as it is embodied in general law. The Italian Government will therefore act on the basis of reciprocity.

KUWAIT

It is understood that the ratification of this Convention does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the Government of the State of Kuwait. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel.

LESOTHO

"The Kingdom of Lesotho will interpret the exemption accorded to members of a consular post by paragraph 3 of article 44 from liability to give evidence concerning matters connected with the exercise of their functions or to produce official correspondence and documents relating thereto as not extending to matters, correspondence or documents connected with the administration of the estate of a deceased person in respect of which a grant of representation has been made to a member of a consular post."

MALTA

Reservations:

"1. Article 5 (j)

The Government of Malta declares that consular posts established in Malta may not execute letters rogatory or commissions to take evidence for the courts of the sending State or transmit judicial or extra-judicial documents.

2. *Article 44 paragraph* 3

Malta will interpret the exemption accorded to members of a consular post by paragraph 3 of article 44 from liability to give evidence concerning matters connected with the exercise of their functions as relating only to acts in respect of which consular officers and consular employees enjoy immunity from the jurisdiction of judicial or administrative authorities of the receiving State in accordance with article 43 of the Convention."

MEXICO

Mexico does not accept that part of article 31, paragraph 4 of the Convention which refers to expropriation of consular premises. The main reason for this reservation is that that paragraph, by contemplating the possibility of expropriation of consular premises by the receiving State, presupposes that the sending State is the owner of the premises. That situation is precluded in the Mexican Republic by article 27 of the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States, according to which foreign States cannot acquire private title to immovable property unless it is situated at the permanent seat of Federal Power and necessary for the direct use of their embassies or legations.

MOROCCO[19]

Morocco's accession to the Convention on Consular Relations shall not in any way imply tacit recognition of "Israel"; nor shall any conventional relations be established between the Kingdom of Morocco and "Israel".

Article 62, concerning the exemption from customs duties on articles for the use of a consular post headed by an honorary consular officer, shall not apply.

Article 65 shall not apply, since honorary consular officers cannot be exempted from obligations in regard to the registration of aliens and residence permits.

MOZAMBIQUE

Declaration:

"As regards articles 74 and 76, the People's Republic of Mozambique considers that these provisions are incompatible with the principle that multilateral international instruments whose purpose and subject matters are of interest to the International Community as a whole should be open for universal participation.

It also considers that the said articles are contrary to the principle of sovereign equality of states and deprive sovereign states from their legitimate right to participate in it."

MYANMAR

Reservations on article 35, paragraph 1 and article 58, paragraphs 1 and 2:

"With regard to article 35, paragraph 1 and article 58, paragraph 1, concerning the freedom of communication, the Government of the Union of Myanmar shall not accord to consular posts headed by honorary consular officers the right to employ diplomatic or consular couriers and diplomatic or consular bags, or to governments, diplomatic missions and other consular posts the right to employ these means in communicating with consular posts headed by honorary consular officers, except to the extent that the Union of Myanmar may have consented thereto in particular cases.

Furthermore, with regard to facilities, privileges and immunities as provided by article 58, paragraph 2, the Government of the Union of Myanmar shall not accord exemption from registration of aliens and residence permits to consular posts headed by honorary consular officers.

Declaration on article 62:

With regard to article 62, the Government of the Union of Myanmar shall not accord to consular posts headed by honorary consular officers exemption from customs duties and taxes on articles for their official use except to the extent that the Union of Myanmar may have consented thereto on the merits of each case."

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands interprets chapter II of the Convention as applying to all career consular officers and employees, including those assigned to a consular post headed by a honorary consular officer."

NORWAY

"With reference to article 22 of the Convention, the Norwegian Government expresses the wish that in countries where it has been an established practice to allow nationals of the receiving State or of a third State to be appointed as Norwegian honorary consuls, this practice will continue to be allowed as before. The Norwegian Government also expresses the hope that countries with which Norway establishes new consular relations will follow a similar practice and will give their consent to such appointments pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 22."

OMAN

"The accession of this Convention does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the Sultanate of Oman and 'Israel'".

QATAR[20]

1. Article 35, paragraph 3:

The Government of Qatar reserves the right to open the consular bag in the following cases:

(a) Where it is evident that the consular bag is being used for unlawful purposes that are incompatible with the objectives for which immunities with respect to the bag were codified. In such a case, the diplomatic mission concerned and its Ministry of Foreign Affairs shall be notified, the bag shall be opened with the approval of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Qatar, and the items determined to be in the bag shall be confiscated in the presence of a representative of the mission to which the bag belongs;

(b) Where the State of Qatar has strong reasons, supported by prima facie evidence, to believe that the consular bag has been used for unlawful purposes, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Qatar may request the consular mission concerned to open the bag in order to ascertain its contents. It shall be opened in the presence of a representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and one member of the mission to which the bag belongs. Should the mission refuse the request to open the bag, then the bag must be returned to its place of origin.

2. Article 36, paragraph 1:

The rights accorded in this article shall not extend to those consular employees who are engaged in administrative tasks or to the members of their families.

3. Article 49:

Local personnel employed by consulates shall not be exempt from the dues and taxes stipulated in this article that are imposed by domestic laws.

4. Accession to the Convention shall under no circumstances imply recognition of Israel and shall not lead to any such dealings with it as are governed by the provisions of the Convention.

ROMANIA

The State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the provisions of articles 74 and 76 of the Convention are incompatible with the principle that multilateral international treaties whose subject-matter and purposes are of interest to the international community as a whole should be open for universal accession.

SAUDI ARABIA[18]

Reservations:

1. Approval of this Convention in no way signifies recognition of Israel and shall not lead to entry with Israel into the relations governed by this Convention.
2. The transmission of the judicial and extrajudicial documents shall be confined to civil and commercial questions and shall in all other cases be effected only by a special agreement.
3. The privileges and immunities provided for under the Convention are guaranteed only for consular staff and their spouses and minor children and shall not extend to other members of their families.
4. The privileges and immunities set forth in chapter III concerning honorary consular officers and consular posts headed by such officers shall be confined to a consular post where the honorary consul is a Saudi Arabian citizen. Consular posts headed by honorary consuls shall not be entitled to use the consular means of correspondence and consular bags referred to in article 35 of the Convention. Governments or other diplomatic missions or consular posts may not use such means of correspondence in their communications with honorary consular posts save within the limits agreed upon in particular cases.

SLOVAKIA[5]

SWEDEN

Reservation:

With regard to article 35, paragraph 1, and article 58, paragraph 1, Sweden does not accord to consular posts headed by honorary consular officers the right to employ diplomatic or consular couriers and diplomatic or consular bags, or to Governments, diplomatic missions and other consular posts the right to employ these means in communicating with consular posts headed by honorary consular officers, except to the extent that Sweden may have consented thereto in particular cases.

Declaration:

"With reference to article 22 of the Convention, the Swedish Government expresses the wish that in countries where it has been an established practice to allow nationals of the receiving State or of a third State to be appointed as Swedish honorary consuls, this will continue to be allowed as before. The Swedish Government also expresses the hope that countries with which Sweden establishes new consular relations will follow a similar practice and will give their consent to such appointments pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 22."

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC[18]

(a) Accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to the said Convention and ratification thereof by its Government does not, in any way, imply recognition of Israel, nor shall they lead to any such dealings with the latter as are governed by the provisions of the Convention;

(b) The Syrian Arab Republic shall be under no obligation to apply article 49 of the Convention to local personnel employed by consulates or to exempt them from dues and taxes.

THAILAND

Interpretative declaration:

"The Government of the Kingdom of Thailand declares that the term 'competent judicial authority' under article 41 (1) of the Convention means all competent officials under Thai criminal procedure."

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES[18]

"The accession of the United Arab Emirates to this Convention shall in no way amount to recognition of nor the establishment of any treaty relation with Israel."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Upon signature:

"The United Kingdom will interpret the exemption accorded to members of a consular post by paragraph 3 of article 44 from liability to give evidence concerning matters connected with the exercise of their functions as relating only to acts in respect of which consular officers and consular employees enjoy immunity from the jurisdiction of the judicial or administrative authorities of the receiving State in accordance with the provisions of article 43 of the Convention."

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

"The United Kingdom hereby confirms its declaration in respect of paragraph 3 of article 44 of the Convention made at the time of signature, and further declares that it will interpret Chapter II of the Convention as applying to all career consular employees, including those employed at a consular post headed by an honorary consular officer."

VIET NAM

Reservation:

The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam shall not accord to the consular posts headed by the honorary consular officers the right to employ diplomatic, consular couriers, diplomatic and consular bags or messages in code or cipher; or to other governments, their diplomatic missions or consular posts headed by the honorary consular officers, unless the Government of the Socialist Re public of Vietnam may give express consent thereto in a particular case.

YEMEN[16,18]

1. The accession of the Yemen Arab Republic to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna on 24 April 1963, in no way implies recognition of Israel and shall not entail the entry of the Yemen Arab Republic with Israel into any of the relations governed by this Convention.

2. The Yemen Arab Republic understands the words "members of their families forming part of their households" in article 46, paragraph 1, and article 49 as being restricted to members of the consular posts and their wives and minor children for the purpose of the privileges and immunities enjoyed by them.

3. Where there are serious and strong grounds for believing that the consular bag contains articles or substances not mentioned in article 35, paragraph 4, of the Convention, the Yemen Arab Republic reserves its right to request that the bag be opened in the presence of a representative of the consular mission concerned. If the consulate refuses to comply with this request, the bag shall be returned to its place of origin.

4. The Yemen Arab Republic shall have the right to in-spect foodstuffs imported by consular representatives in order to ascertain that they conform in quantity and in kind to the list submitted by them to the customs authorities and the Office of Protocol at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the purpose of obtaining approval for their importation exempt from customs duties.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

DENMARK

"The Government of Denmark objects to the reservations made by the Arab Republic of Egypt to paragraph 1 of article 46 and to articles 49, 62 and 65 of the Convention and to the reservation made by Italy to paragraph 1(c) of article 36 of the Convention."

FRANCE

The Government of the French Republic does not regard as valid the reservations to articles 46, 49, 62 and 65 of the Convention made by the Government of the United Arab Republic. This declaration shall not be regarded as an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the French Republic and the United Arab Republic.

GERMANY[7]

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany does not regard as valid the reservations to articles 46, 49, 62 and 65 of the Convention made by the Government of the United Arab Republic.

This declaration shall not be regarded as an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Arab Republic."

25 July 1977

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany regards the reservations made by the Kingdom of Morocco in respect of articles 62 and 65 of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 24 April 1963 as incompatible with the purpose and objective of the Convention.

This declaration shall, however, not be regarded as an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Kingdom of Morocco.

ISRAEL

25 March 1999

With regard to the reservation made by Qatar upon accession:

"The instrument of accession by the Government of Qatar to the [...] Convention contains a statement of a political character in respect ot Israel. In the view of the Government of Israel, this is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. That declaration cannot in any way affect the obligations of Qatar already existing under general International Law and under this particular Convention. The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards Qatar an attitude of complete reciprocity."

LUXEMBOURG

The Government of Luxembourg is not in a position to accept the reservations formulated by the Government of Cuba regarding articles 74 and 76 of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, done on 24 April 1963.

NETHERLANDS[21]

1. The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not regard as valid the reservations to the articles 46, 49 and 62 of the Convention made by the United Arab Republic. This declaration should not be regarded as an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the United Arab Republic.

2. The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not regard as valid the reservation to article 62 of the Convention made by the Kingdom of Morocco. This declaration should not be regarded as an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Kingdom of Morocco.

5 December 1986

The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the reservation made by the Yemen Arab Republic concerning the articles 46, paragraph 1, and 49 of the Convention only in so far as it does not purport to exclude the husbands of female members of the consular posts from enjoying the same privileges and immunities under the present Convention.

17 February 1998

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers the declaration with regard to article 62 of [the said Convention] made by the Government of Myanmar as a reservation and does not regard this reservation as valid. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Union of Myanmar."

1. The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not regard as valid the reservations to the articles 46, 49 and 62 of

the Convention made by the United Arab Republic. This declaration should not be regarded as an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the United Arab Republic.

2. The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not regard as valid the reservation to article 62 of the Convention made by the Kingdom of Morocco. This declaration should not be regarded as an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Kingdom of Morocco.

5 December 1986

The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the reservation made by the Yemen Arab Republic concerning the articles 46, paragraph 1, and 49 of the Convention only in so far as it does not purport to exclude the husbands of female members of the consular posts from enjoying the same privileges and immunities under the present Convention.

17 February 1998

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers the declaration with regard to article 62 of [the said Convention] made by the Government of Myanmar as a reservation and does not regard this reservation as valid. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Union of Myanmar."

SWEDEN

13 December 1999

With regard to reservations made by Qatar upon accession:

“The Government of Sweden Notes that the reservations concerning article 35, paragraph 3, goes beyond the rights of the receiving State not only in relation to the Convention, but also according to customary international law.

In the opinion of the Government of Sweden, the protection of the consular bag constitutes an important element of the Convention and any reservation intended to allow a receiving State to open the consular bag without the approval of the sending State, or alter the use of terms codified through the Convention, is a serious qualification of the freedom of communication regime.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the reservations to article 35, paragraph 3, of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations made by the Government of Qatar.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Sweden and Qatar. Furthermore, the Government of Sweden takes the view that article 35, paragraph 3, remains in force in relations between Sweden and Qatar by virtue of international customary law.”

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

4 September 1987

"The Government of the United States wishes to state its objection to the reservation regarding the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations made with respect to paragraph 3 of article 35 by the Yemen Arab Republic.

The Government of the United States Notes that the reservation made with respect to paragraph l of Article 46 and Article 49 of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations by the Yemen Arab Republic states that the Yemen Arab Republic understands the term "members of their families forming part of their households" in paragraph l of Article 46 and Article 49 as being restricted to members of the consular posts and, *inter alia* , their wives for the purpose of the privileges and immunities enjoyed by them. The United States understands this term to include members of the consular posts and their spouses, regardless of whether the spouse is a husband or wife. Accordingly, the Government of the United States wishes to state its objection if the Yemen Arab Republic does not include all spouses of the members of the consular posts as being within the meaning of the term "members of their families forming part of their households" in paragraph l of Article 46 and Article 49.

The Government of the United States, however, considers the [Convention] as continuing in force between it and the respective above-mentioned States except for the provisions to which the reservations are addressed in each case."

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 24 April 1963 and 8 February 1965, respectively. See also note 1 under “Bosnia and Herzegovina”, “Croatia”, “former Yugoslavia”, “Slovenia”, “The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” and “Yugoslavia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] See note 2 under “China” and note 2 under “United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland” regarding Hong Kong under in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The Convention was signed on 24 April 1963 on behalf of the Republic of China. See also note 1 under “China” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

Upon accession, the Government of China made the following declaration:

"The Taiwan authorities' signature on this Convention in the name of China is illegal and null and void."

[4] See note 3 under “China” and note 1 under “Portugal” regarding Macao in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 31 March 1964 and 13 March 1968, respectively, with a declaration. For the text of the declaration made upon signature, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 596, p. 429. See also note 1 under “Czech Republic” and note 1 under “Slovakia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under “Germany” regarding Berlin (West) in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 9 September 1987 with the following reservation:

1. While acceding to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 24 April 1963 the German Democratic Republic

reserves itself the right, in accordance with Article 73 of the Convention, to conclude agreements with other States-parties in order to supplement and complete the provisions as regards bilateral relations. This concerns, in particular, the status, privileges and immunities of independent consular missions and their members as well as the consular tasks.

2. The German Democratic Republic holds the opinion that the provisions of Articles 74 and 76 of the Convention are in contradiction to the principle according to which all states that are guided in their policy by the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter have the right to accede to conventions affecting the interests of all states.

See also note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under “Montenegro” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 1 under “Netherlands” regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[11] On 16 March 1994, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Greece the following communication:

"Accession of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Convention on Consular Relations of 1963 does not imply its recognition on behalf of the Hellenic Republic."

See also note 1 under “Greece” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[12] In a communication accompanying the notification of succession, the Government of Tuvalu declared that it had decided not to succeed to the Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, done at Vienna on 18 April 1961, and that pursuant to Tuvalu's declaration, dated 19 December 1978, regarding treaties applied before independence, the application of the Optional Protocol to Tuvalu should be regarded as terminated as at 1 September 1982.

[13] In respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Associated States (Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, St. Christopher-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia and St. Vincent) and territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom, as well as the British Solomon Islands Protectorate.

[14] The instrument of ratification does not maintain the reservations made on behalf of the Government of Venezuela upon signature of the Convention. On depositing the said instrument, the Permanent Representative of Venezuela to the United Nations confirmed that those reservations should be considered as withdrawn. For the text of the reservations in question, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 596, p. 452.

[15] The Republic of Viet Nam had acceded to the Convention on 10 May 1973. See also note 1 under “Viet Nam” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[16] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 1 under “Yemen” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[17] In a notification received on 18 January 1980, the Government of Egypt informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation under paragraph 1 which related to Israel. The notification indicates 25 January 1980 as the effective date of the withdrawal. For the text of that reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 596, p. 456.

[18] In a communication received on 16 March 1966, the Government of Israel declared that it "has noted the political character of paragraph 1 of the declaration made by the Government of the United Arab Republic [see also note 1 under “United Arab Republic” (“Egypt” and “Syria”) in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume and note 13 in this chapter]. In the view of the Government of Israel, the Convention and Protocol are not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of the United Arab Republic an attitude of complete reciprocity."

Identical communications, in essence, *mutatis mutandis* , have been received by the Secretary-General from the Government of Israel on 16 March 1970 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by Iraq; on 12 May 1977 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by the United Arab Emirates; on 11 May 1979 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by the Syrian Arab Republic; on 1 September 1987 in respect of the reservation made upon accession by Yemen; and on 29 November 1989 in respect of the reservation made by Saudi Arabia upon accession.

[19] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 4 April 1977, the Government of Morocco declared that 'the reservation concerning Israel ... constituted a declaration of general policy which did not affect the legal effects of the provisions of the said Convention as far as their application in respect of the Kingdom of Morocco was concerned'.

In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 12 May 1977 the Government of Israel made the following declaration:

"The instrument deposited by the Government of Morocco contains a statement of a political character in respect to Israel. In the view of the Government of Israel, this is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements which are, moreover, in flagrant contradiction to the principles, objects and purposes of the Organization. That pronouncement by the Government of Morocco cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Morocco under general international law or under particular treaties.

"The Government of Israel will, insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Morocco an attitude of complete reciprocity."

[20] In regard to the reservations made by Qatar upon

accession, the Secretary-General received communications from the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Finland (17 March 2000) :

"The Government of Finland Notes that the inviolability of the official correspondence between the Sending State and the consular post can be considered one of the main objects of the Convention. As Qatar reserves the right to open a consular bag without a prior consent by the Sending State, it is the view of the Government of Finland that the above-mentioned reservation to Article 35 is in clear contradiction with the object and purpose of the Convention.

According to the reservation to Article 46, para. 1, Qatar reserves the right to subject those consular employees who are engaged in administrative tasks or the members of their families to registration of aliens and residence permits. Para. 2 of Article 46 contains an exhaustive list of persons who are not exempt from the requirement of registration of aliens and residence permits. Given that the consular employees who are engaged in administrative tasks or the members of their families are covered by Article 46 para. 1, and as they are not included in the list of para. 2 of the same article, it is the opinion of the Government of Finland that the reservation is not in conformity with Article 46, nor with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of Qatar to the said Convention. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Qatar and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two states without Qatar benefitting from the reservation".

Netherlands (17 July 2000) :

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservation made by the Government of Qatar in relation to article 35, paragraph 3, of the said Convention.

The Government of the Kingdome Netherlands Notes that the inviolability of the consular bag constitutes an important element of the Convention and any reservation intended to allow a receiving State to open the consular bag without the approval of the sending State is not only in contradiction with the very language of article 35, paragraph 3, of the Convention but also with customary international law.

Furthermore, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservation made by the Government of Qatar in relation to Article 46, paragraph 1, of the said Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands Notes that Article 46, paragraph 2, contains an exhaustive list of persons who are not exempt from the requirement of registration of aliens and residence permits. Given that the consular employees who are engaged in administrative tasks or the members of their families are covered by Article 46, paragraph 1, and are not included in the aforesaid list, the reservation concerning article 46, paragraph 1, is not in conformity with paragraph 2 of the same article, nor with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Qatar. These objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Qatar."

[21] In regard to the objection made by the Government of Netherlands 5 December 1986 to the reservation made by the Yemen Arab Repuiblic, the Secretary-General received, on 28 May 1987, from the Government of Yemen the following communication:

[The Government of Yemen] should like to make clear in this connection that it was our country's intention in making that reservation that the expression "family of a member of the consular post" should, for the purposes of enjoyment of the privileges and immunities specified in the Convention, be understood to mean the member of the consular post, his spouse and minor children only.

[The Government of Yemen] should like to make it clear that this reservation is not intended to exclude the husbands of female members of the consular posts, as was suggested in the Netherlands interpretation, since it is natural that husbands should in such cases enjoy the same privileges and immunities.

7. OPTIONAL PROTOCOL TO THE VIENNA CONVENTION ON CONSULAR RELATIONS CONCERNING ACQUISITION OF NATIONALITY

Vienna, 24 April 1963

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	19 March 1967, in accordance with article VI(1).
REGISTRATION:	8 June 1967, No. 8639.
STATUS:	Signatories: 19. Parties: 39.
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 596, p. 469.

Note: See *"Note:"* in chapter III.6.

Participant[1,2]	*Signature, Succession to signature(d)*	*Ratification, Accession(a)*
Belgium		9 Sep 1970 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[3]	12 Jan 1994 d	
Botswana		12 May 2008 a
Brazil	24 Apr 1963	
Bulgaria		11 Jul 1989 a
Cameroon	21 Aug 1963	
Colombia	24 Apr 1963	
Congo	24 Apr 1963	
Democratic Republic of the Congo	24 Apr 1963	
Denmark	24 Apr 1963	15 Nov 1972
Dominican Republic	24 Apr 1963	4 Mar 1964
Egypt		21 Jun 1965 a
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Finland	28 Oct 1963	2 Jul 1980
Gabon		23 Feb 1965 a
Germany[4,5]	31 Oct 1963	7 Sep 1971
Ghana	24 Apr 1963	4 Oct 1963
Iceland		1 Jun 1978 a
India		28 Nov 1977 a
Indonesia		4 Jun 1982 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		5 Jun 1975 a
Iraq[6]		14 Jan 1970 a
Italy	22 Nov 1963	25 Jun 1969
Kenya		1 Jul 1965 a
Kuwait	10 Jan 1964	
Lao People's Democratic Republic		9 Aug 1973 a
Liberia	24 Apr 1963	
Madagascar		17 Feb 1967 a
Malawi		23 Feb 1981 a
Montenegro[7]	23 Oct 2006 d	
Morocco		23 Feb 1977 a
Nepal		28 Sep 1965 a
Netherlands[8]		17 Dec 1985 a
New Zealand[9]		5 Sep 2003 a
Nicaragua		9 Jan 1990 a
Niger		21 Jun 1978 a
Norway	24 Apr 1963	13 Feb 1980
Oman		31 May 1974 a
Panama	4 Dec 1963	28 Aug 1967
Paraguay		23 Dec 1969 a
Philippines		15 Nov 1965 a
Republic of Korea		7 Mar 1977 a
Senegal		29 Apr 1966 a
Serbia[3]	12 Mar 2001 d	
Suriname		11 Sep 1980 a
Sweden	8 Oct 1963	19 Mar 1974
Switzerland		12 Jun 1992 a
Thailand		15 Apr 1999 a
Tunisia		24 Jan 1968 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification or accession.)

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

The Kingdom of the Netherlands interprets the words "not, solely by the operation of the law of the receiving State" in article II of the Optional Protocol concerning Acquisition of Nationality as meaning that acquisition of nationality by descent is not regarded as acquisition of nationality solely by the operation of this law.

Notes:

[1] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 24 April 1963. *See also note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.*

[2] The Republic of Viet-Nam had acceded to the Protocol on 10 May 1973. See also note 1 under "Viet Nam" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The former Yugoslavia had signed the Optional Protocol on 24 April 1963. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See chapter III.6 for the text of the reservation contained in the instrument of accession by the Government of Iraq to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations and to this Protocol and note in the same chapter for the communication received in this regard by the Government of Israel.

[7] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] With a territorial exclusion in respect of the Tokelau Islands:

"Declares that, consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand to the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, this accession shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory."

8. OPTIONAL PROTOCOL TO THE VIENNA CONVENTION ON CONSULAR RELATIONS CONCERNING THE COMPULSORY SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

Vienna, 24 April 1963

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	19 March 1967 by the exchange of the said letters, in accordance with VIII.
REGISTRATION:	8 June 1967, No. 8640.
STATUS:	Signatories: 38. Parties: 48.[1]
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 596, p. 487.

Note: See *"Note:"* in chapter III.6.

Participant[2,3]	*Signature, Succession to signature(d)*	*Ratification, Accession(a)*
Argentina	24 Apr 1963	
Australia		12 Feb 1973 a
Austria	24 Apr 1963	12 Jun 1969
Belgium	31 Mar 1964	9 Sep 1970
Benin	24 Apr 1963	
Bosnia and Herzegovina[4]	12 Jan 1994 d	
Botswana		12 May 2008 a
Bulgaria		11 Jul 1989 a
Burkina Faso	24 Apr 1963	11 Aug 1964
Cameroon	21 Aug 1963	
Central African Republic	24 Apr 1963	
Chile	24 Apr 1963	
Colombia	24 Apr 1963	
Congo	24 Apr 1963	
Côte d'Ivoire	24 Apr 1963	
Democratic Republic of the Congo	24 Apr 1963	
Denmark	24 Apr 1963	15 Nov 1972
Dominican Republic	24 Apr 1963	4 Mar 1964
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Finland	28 Oct 1963	2 Jul 1980
France	24 Apr 1963	31 Dec 1970
Gabon	24 Apr 1963	23 Feb 1965
Germany[5,6]	31 Oct 1963	7 Sep 1971
Ghana	24 Apr 1963	
Hungary		8 Dec 1989 a
Iceland		1 Jun 1978 a
India		28 Nov 1977 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		5 Jun 1975 a
Ireland	24 Apr 1963	
Italy	22 Nov 1963	25 Jun 1969
Japan		3 Oct 1983 a
Kenya		1 Jul 1965 a
Kuwait	10 Jan 1964	
Lao People's Democratic Republic		9 Aug 1973 a
Lebanon	24 Apr 1963	
Liberia	24 Apr 1963	
Liechtenstein	24 Apr 1963	18 May 1966
Luxembourg	24 Mar 1964	8 Mar 1972
Madagascar		17 Feb 1967 a
Malawi		23 Feb 1981 a
Mauritius		13 May 1970 a
Mexico		15 Mar 2002 a
Montenegro[7]	23 Oct 2006 d	
Nepal		28 Sep 1965 a
Netherlands[8]		17 Dec 1985 a
New Zealand[9]		10 Sep 1974 a
Nicaragua		9 Jan 1990 a
Niger	24 Apr 1963	21 Jun 1978
Norway	24 Apr 1963	13 Feb 1980
Oman		31 May 1974 a
Pakistan		29 Mar 1976 a
Panama	4 Dec 1963	28 Aug 1967
Paraguay		23 Dec 1969 a
Peru	24 Apr 1963	23 Mar 2007
Philippines	24 Apr 1963	15 Nov 1965
Republic of Korea		7 Mar 1977 a
Romania		19 Sep 2007 a
Senegal		29 Apr 1966 a
Serbia[4]	12 Mar 2001 d	
Seychelles		29 May 1979 a
Slovakia		27 Apr 1999 a
Suriname		11 Sep 1980 a
Sweden	8 Oct 1963	19 Mar 1974
Switzerland	23 Oct 1963	3 May 1965

***Participant*[2,3]**	***Signature, Succession to signature(d)***	***Ratification, Accession(a)***
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[10]	27 Mar 1964	9 May 1972
United States of America[1]	[24 Apr 1963]	[24 Nov 1969]
Uruguay	24 Apr 1963	

Notes:

[1] On 7 March 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United States of America, a communication notifying its withdrawal from the Optional Protocol. The communication reads as follows:

"... the Government of the United States of America [refers] to the Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations Concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, done at Vienna April 24, 1963.

This letter constitutes notification by the United States of America that it hereby withdraws from the aforesaid Protocol. As a consequence of this withdrawal, the United States will no longer recognize the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice reflected in that Protocol."

[2] The Republic of Viet-Nam had acceded to the Protocol on 10 May 1973. See also note 1 under "Viet Nam" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 24 April 1963. See also note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] The former Yugoslavia had signed the Optional Protocol on 24 April 1963. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] In a communication deposited on 24 January 1972 with the Registrar of the International Court of Justice, who transmitted it to the Secretary-General pursuant to operative paragraph 3 of Security Council resolution 9 (1946) of 15 October 1946, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated as follows:

"In respect of any dispute between the Federal Republic of Germany and any Party to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 24 April 1963 and to the Optional Protocol thereto concerning the Coompulsory Settlement of disputes that may arise within the scope of that Protocol, the Federal Republic of Germany accepts the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. This declaration also applies to such disputes as may arise, within the scope of article IV of the Optional Protocol concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, in connexion with the Optional Protocol concnerning the Acquisition of antionality.

"It is in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and with the terms and subject to theconditions of the Statute and Rules of the Internaitonal Court of Justice that the jurisdiction of the Court is hereby recognized.

"The Federal Republic of Germany undertakes to comply in good faith with the decisions of the Court and to accpet all the obligations of a Member of the United Nations under article 94 of the Charter."

See also note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] In respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Associated States (Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, St. Chrisopher-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia and St. Vincent) and territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom, as well as the British Solomon Islands Protectorate.

9. CONVENTION ON SPECIAL MISSIONS

New York, 8 December 1969

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	21 June 1985, in accordance with article 53(1).
REGISTRATION:	21 June 1985, No. 23431.
STATUS:	Signatories: 12. Parties: 38.
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1400, p. 231.

Note: The present Convention was opened for signature by all States Members of the United Nations or of the International Atomic Energy Agency or Parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice, and by any other State invited by the General Assembly of the United Nations to become a Party to the Convention, from 16 December 1969 until 31 December 1970 at United Nations Headquarters in at New York.

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Argentina	18 Dec 1969	13 Oct 1972
Austria		22 Aug 1978 a
Belarus		28 Aug 1997 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]		1 Sep 1993 d
Bulgaria		14 May 1987 a
Chile		19 Oct 1979 a
Colombia		29 Oct 2004 a
Croatia[2]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba		9 Jun 1976 a
Cyprus	18 Sep 1970	24 Jan 1972
Czech Republic[3]		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		22 May 1985 a
El Salvador	18 Dec 1970	
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Fiji		18 Oct 1972 a
Finland	28 Dec 1970	
Georgia		22 Jun 2005 a
Guatemala		12 Feb 1988 a
Indonesia		4 Jun 1982 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		5 Jun 1975 a
Israel	9 Nov 1970	
Jamaica	18 Dec 1969	
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Liechtenstein	15 Dec 1970	3 Aug 1977
Lithuania		5 Aug 2004 a
Mexico		31 Jan 1979 a
Montenegro[4]		23 Oct 2006 d
Nicaragua	18 Sep 1970	
Paraguay		19 Sep 1975 a
Philippines	16 Dec 1969	26 Nov 1976
Poland		22 Mar 1977 a
Rwanda		29 Nov 1977 a
Serbia[2]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		28 Dec 1977 a
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[2]		6 Jul 1992 d
Spain		31 May 2001 a
Switzerland	31 Jul 1970	3 Nov 1977
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		29 Dec 2005 d
Tonga		18 Jan 1977 a
Tunisia	19 Aug 1970	2 Nov 1971
Ukraine		27 Aug 1993 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	17 Dec 1970	
Uruguay		17 Dec 1980 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BULGARIA

Reservation concerning article 8:

In accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that in case of difference on specifying the size of the special mission, this question should be settled by agreement between the sending State and the receiving State.

Reservation concerning article 25:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria does not accept the provision of article 25, paragraph 1 of the Convention, according to which the agents of the receiving State may enter the premises where the special mission is established in case of fire or other disaster without the express consent of the head of the special mission or, where appropriate, of the head of the permanent mission.

Declaration:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers it necessary to underline that article 50 of the Convention, which precludes a number of States from becoming parties to it, is of an unjustifiably restrictive character. This provision is incompatible with the very nature of the Convention, which is of a universal character and should be open for accession by all States.

CUBA

Reservation:

The Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba enters an express reservation with regard to the third sentence of paragraph 1 of article 25 of the Convention, and consequently does not accept the assumption of consent to enter the premises of the special mission for any of the reasons mentioned in that paragraph or for any other reasons.

Declaration:

The Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba considers the provisions of articles 50 and 52 of the Convention to be discriminatory in nature because, whereas the Convention deals with matters affecting the interests of all States, the said provisions deny a number of States the right to sign and accede to the Convention, a situation which is contrary to the principle of the sovereign equality of States.

CZECH REPUBLIC[3]

SLOVAKIA[3]

Notes:

[1] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 28 December 1970. See also note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 18 December 1969 and 5 March 1974, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 1 October 1976 with a reservation. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1400, p. 338. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

10. OPTIONAL PROTOCOL TO THE CONVENTION ON SPECIAL MISSIONS CONCERNING THE COMPULSORY SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

New York, 8 December 1969

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	21 June 1985, in accordance with article VII(1).
REGISTRATION:	21 June 1985, No. 23431.
STATUS:	Signatories: 8. Parties: 17.
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1400, p. 339.

Note: The present Protocol was opened for signature by all States which could become Parties to the Convention, from 16 December 1969 unitl 31 December 1970 at United Nations Headquarters in New York.

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Austria		22 Aug 1978 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]		12 Jan 1994 d
Cyprus	31 Dec 1970	24 Jan 1972
El Salvador	18 Dec 1970	
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Finland	28 Dec 1970	
Guatemala		12 Feb 1988 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		5 Jun 1975 a
Jamaica	1 Jul 1970	
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Liechtenstein	15 Dec 1970	3 Aug 1977
Montenegro[3]		23 Oct 2006 d
Paraguay		19 Sep 1975 a
Philippines	16 Dec 1969	26 Nov 1976
Serbia[2]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		28 Dec 1977 a
Slovakia		27 Apr 1999 a
Spain		31 May 2001 a
Switzerland	31 Jul 1970	3 Nov 1977
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	17 Dec 1970	
Uruguay		17 Dec 1980 a

Notes:

[1] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 28 December 1970. See also note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Optional Protocol on 18 December 1969 and 5 March 1974, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

11. VIENNA CONVENTION ON THE REPRESENTATION OF STATES IN THEIR RELATIONS WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OF A UNIVERSAL CHARACTER

Vienna, 14 March 1975

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 89 which reads as follows: "1. The present Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day following the date of deposit of the thirty-fifth instrument of ratification or accession. 2. For each State ratifying or acceding to the Convention after the deposit of the thirty-fifth instrument of ratification or accession, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after the deposit of such State of its instrument of ratification or accession.".

STATUS: Signatories: 20. Parties: 34.

TEXT: Doc. A/CONF.67/16.

Note: The Convention was adopted on 13 March 1975 by the United Nations Conference on the Representation of States in their Relations with International Organizations held at the Neue Hofburg in Vienna, Austria, from 4 February to 14 March 1975. The Convention was opened for signature at Vienna on 14 March 1975 at the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Austria. After 30 September 1975, it remained open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters in New York until 30 March 1976, the closing date for signature.

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Argentina	7 Apr 1975	6 Mar 1981
Barbados	29 Mar 1976	26 Nov 1979
Belarus	13 Oct 1975	24 Aug 1978
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]		1 Sep 1993 d
Brazil	14 Mar 1975	
Bulgaria	26 Nov 1975	23 Feb 1976
Cameroon		23 Mar 1984 a
Chile	28 Nov 1975	22 Jul 1976
Croatia[2]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba	30 Mar 1976	30 Apr 1981
Cyprus		14 Mar 1978 a
Czech Republic[3]		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		14 Dec 1982 a
Ecuador	25 Aug 1975	6 Jan 1976
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Gabon		5 Nov 2004 a
Guatemala		14 Sep 1981 a
Holy See	14 Mar 1975	
Hungary	12 Feb 1976	28 Jul 1978
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		30 Dec 1988 a
Jamaica		16 Nov 1990 a
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Mongolia	30 Oct 1975	14 Dec 1976
Montenegro[4]		23 Oct 2006 d
Nigeria	17 Dec 1975	
Panama	12 Mar 1976	16 Mar 1977
Paraguay		23 Sep 2008 a
Peru	14 Mar 1975	
Poland	10 Nov 1975	1 Nov 1979
Russian Federation	10 Oct 1975	8 Aug 1978
Rwanda		29 Nov 1977 a
Serbia[2]		12 Mar 2001 d
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[2]		6 Jul 1992 d
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[2]		10 Mar 1994 d
Tunisia		13 Oct 1977 a
Turkey	30 Mar 1976	
Ukraine	17 Oct 1975	25 Aug 1978
United Republic of Tanzania	29 Mar 1976	
Viet Nam		26 Aug 1980 a
Yemen[5]	30 Mar 1976	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BELARUS

In ratifying the 1975 Vienna Convention on the representation of States in their relations with international organizations of a universal character, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers it necessary to state that the principle of the full inviolability of the official premises of delegations to international conferences is a norm of customary international law which should be observed by all States.

GUATEMALA

Reservation:

The Republic of Guatemala, upon acceding to the Vienna Convention on the Representation of States in their Relations with International Organizations of a Universal Character, makes an express reservation with respect to articles 84 and 85, which it does not accept as applying to article 77, paragraph 4, when, in its capacity as the host State, it disapproves of the conduct of one or more persons enjoying privileges and immunity under the Convention, in which case it shall retain the right to take unilaterally, as a necessary measure for its own protection, the action of notifying the sending State at any time and without having to explain its decision that such person or persons are *persona non grata* in the country. The reservation concerning the non-applicability of articles 84 and 85 also refers to the right of the Republic of Guatemala to declare any person who, by virtue of the Convention, would enjoy privileges and immunity unacceptable before his arrival in its territory, without stating any reason.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

In ratifying the 1975 Vienna Convention on the Representation of States in their Relations with International Organizations of a Universal Character, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics deems it necessary to state that the principle of the absolute inviolability of the offices of delegations to international conferences is a rule of customary international law which must be observed by all States.

UKRAINE

In ratifying the Vienna Convention on the Representation of States in their relations with international organizations of a universal character of 1975, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic is constrained to declare that the principle of total inviolability of working premises of delegations at international conferences is a rule of customary international law to which all States must adhere.

VIET NAM

Adhering to this Convention, the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam deems it necessary to stress that the absolute inviolability privilege accorded the offices and residences of the representations of member States at International Organizations has been established as a principle in the practice of international law and therefore must be strictly observed by all States.

Notes:

[1] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 15 March 1976 and 28 June 1988, respectively. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 14 March 1975 and 20 September 1977, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 24 February 1976 and 30 August 1976, respectively. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume

12. VIENNA CONVENTION ON SUCCESSION OF STATES IN RESPECT OF STATE PROPERTY, ARCHIVES AND DEBTS

Vienna, 8 April 1983

NOT YET IN FORCE:	see article 50 which reads as follows: "1. The present Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day following the date of deposit of the fifteenth instrument of ratification or accession. 2. For each State ratifying or acceding to the Convention after the deposit of the fifteenth instrument of ratification or accession, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirteith day after deposit by such State of its instrument of ratification or accession.".
STATUS:	Signatories: 7. Parties: 7.
TEXT:	Doc. A/CONF.117/14. C.N.358.2008.TREATIES-1 of 6 May 2008 (Proposal of corrections to the original text of the Convention (Arabic text) and to the Certified True Copies) and C.N.555.2008.TREATIES-2 of 21 August 2008 (corrections).

Note: The Convention was adopted on 7 April 1983 and was opened for signature on 8 April 1983 by the United Nations Conference on Succession of States in respect of State Property, Archives and Debts. The Convention remained open for signature until 30 June 1984. The Conference was convened pursuant to General Assembly resolution 36/113[1] of 10 December 1981 and 37/11[2]of 15 November 1982. The Conference met at the Neue Hofburg in Vienna from 1 March to 8 April 1983. In addition to the Convention, the Conference adopted the Final Act and certain resolutions, which are an nexed to that Act. By unanimous decision of the Conference, the original of the Final Act was deposited in the archives of the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Austria. For the text of the Final Act, see Conference document A/CONF./117/15 of 7 April 1983.

Participant	*Signature, Succession to signature(d)*	*Ratification, Accession(a)*
Algeria	16 May 1983	
Argentina	30 Dec 1983	
Croatia		11 Apr 1994 a
Egypt	30 Jun 1984	
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Georgia		12 Jul 1993 a
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Montenegro[3]	23 Oct 2006 d	
Niger	23 May 1984	
Peru	10 Nov 1983	
Serbia[4]	12 Mar 2001 d	
Slovenia		15 Aug 2002 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		2 Sep 1997 a
Ukraine		8 Jan 1993 a

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 51* (A/36/51), p. 243.

[2] *Ibid., Thirty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 51* (A/37/51), p. 263.

[3] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] The former Yugoslavia had signed the Convention on 24 October 1983. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

13. UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON JURISDICTIONAL IMMUNITIES OF STATES AND THEIR PROPERTY

New York, 2 December 2004

NOT YET IN FORCE: in accordance with article 30 which reads as follows: "1. The present Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day following the date of deposit of the thirtieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. 2. For each State ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to the present Convention after the deposit of the thirtieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after the deposit by such State of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.".

STATUS: Signatories: 28. Parties: 6.

TEXT: Doc. A/59/508; depositary notification C.N.141.2005.TREATIES-4 of 28 February 2005&lt;/a&gt; [Proposal of corrections to the original text of the Convention (Chinese version)] and C.N.419.2005.TREATIES-6 of 31 May 2005 [Corrections to the original text of the Convention (Chinese version)]; C.N.359.2008.TREATIES-1 of 6 May 2008 (Proposal of corrections to the original text of the Convention (Arabic text) and to the Certified True Copies) and C.N.556.2008.TREATIES-2 of 21 August 2008 (corrections).

Note: The above Convention was adopted during the 65th plenary meeting of the General Assembly by resolution A/59/38 of 2 December 2004. In accordance with its articles 28 and 33, the Convention shall be open for signature by all States from 17 January 2005 until 17 January 2007, at United Nations Headquarters in New York.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance(A), Approval(AA), Accession(a)*
Austria	17 Jan 2005	14 Sep 2006
Belgium	22 Apr 2005	
China	14 Sep 2005	
Czech Republic	13 Oct 2006	
Denmark	19 Sep 2006	
Estonia	30 Mar 2006	
Finland	14 Sep 2005	
France	17 Jan 2007	
Iceland	16 Sep 2005	
India	12 Jan 2007	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	17 Jan 2007	29 Sep 2008
Japan	11 Jan 2007	
Lebanon	11 Nov 2005	21 Nov 2008
Madagascar	15 Sep 2005	
Mexico	25 Sep 2006	
Morocco	17 Jan 2005	
Norway	8 Jul 2005	27 Mar 2006
Paraguay	16 Sep 2005	
Portugal	25 Feb 2005	14 Sep 2006
Romania	14 Sep 2005	15 Feb 2007
Russian Federation	1 Dec 2006	
Senegal	21 Sep 2005	
Sierra Leone	21 Sep 2006	
Slovakia	15 Sep 2005	
Sweden	14 Sep 2005	
Switzerland	19 Sep 2006	
Timor-Leste	16 Sep 2005	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	30 Sep 2005	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance. approval or accession.)

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Reservation:

"Pursuant to Article 27, paragraph 3 of the United Nations Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and Their Property, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 27, paragraph 2 of the Convention. The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran affirms that the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary, in each individual case, for the submission of the dispute to the International Court of Justice. The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran can, if it deems appropriate, for the settlement of such a dispute, agree with the submission of the dispute to arbitration in accordance with its related domestic law."

NORWAY

Declaration:

"Recalling inter alia resolution 59/38 adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 2 December 2004, in which the General Assembly took into account, when adopting the Convention, the statement of 25 October 2004 of the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and Their Property introducing the Committee's report, Norway hereby states its understanding that the Convention does not apply to military activities, including the activities of armed forces during an armed conflict, as those terms are understood under international humanitarian law, and activities undertaken by military forces of a State in the exercise of their official duties. Such activities remain subject to other rules of international law. Similarly, as also noted in the said statement, the Convention does not apply where there is a special immunity regime, including immunities ratione personae. Thus, the express mention of heads of State in Article 3 should not be read as suggesting that the immunity ratione personae of other State officials is affected by the Convention.

Furthermore, in cases where it has been established that property of a State is specifically in use or intended for use by the State for other than government non-commercial purposes and is in the territory of the State of the forum, it is the understanding of Norway that Article 18 does not prevent pre-judgement measures of constraint from being taken against property that has a connection with the entity against which the proceeding was directed.

Finally, Norway understands that the Convention is without prejudice to any future international development in the protection of human rights."

CHAPTER IV

HUMAN RIGHTS

1. CONVENTION ON THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF THE CRIME OF GENOCIDE.

New York, 9 December 1948[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 12 January 1951, in accordance with article XIII.
REGISTRATION: 12 January 1951, No. 1021.
STATUS: Signatories: 41. Parties: 140.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 78, p. 277.

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Afghanistan		22 Mar 1956 a
Albania		12 May 1955 a
Algeria		31 Oct 1963 a
Andorra		22 Sep 2006 a
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 d
Argentina		5 Jun 1956 a
Armenia		23 Jun 1993 a
Australia	11 Dec 1948	8 Jul 1949
Austria		19 Mar 1958 a
Azerbaijan		16 Aug 1996 a
Bahamas		5 Aug 1975 d
Bahrain		27 Mar 1990 a
Bangladesh		5 Oct 1998 a
Barbados		14 Jan 1980 a
Belarus	16 Dec 1949	11 Aug 1954
Belgium	12 Dec 1949	5 Sep 1951
Belize		10 Mar 1998 a
Bolivia	11 Dec 1948	14 Jun 2005
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2,3]		29 Dec 1992 d
Brazil	11 Dec 1948	15 Apr 1952
Bulgaria		21 Jul 1950 a
Burkina Faso		14 Sep 1965 a
Burundi		6 Jan 1997 a
Cambodia		14 Oct 1950 a
Canada	28 Nov 1949	3 Sep 1952
Chile	11 Dec 1948	3 Jun 1953
China[4,5,6]	20 Jul 1949	18 Apr 1983
Colombia	12 Aug 1949	27 Oct 1959
Comoros		27 Sep 2004 a
Costa Rica		14 Oct 1950 a
Côte d'Ivoire		18 Dec 1995 a

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Croatia[2]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba[7]	28 Dec 1949	4 Mar 1953
Cyprus[8]		29 Mar 1982 a
Czech Republic[9]		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		31 Jan 1989 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo		31 May 1962 d
Denmark	28 Sep 1949	15 Jun 1951
Dominican Republic	11 Dec 1948	
Ecuador	11 Dec 1948	21 Dec 1949
Egypt	12 Dec 1948	8 Feb 1952
El Salvador	27 Apr 1949	28 Sep 1950
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Ethiopia	11 Dec 1948	1 Jul 1949
Fiji		11 Jan 1973 d
Finland		18 Dec 1959 a
France	11 Dec 1948	14 Oct 1950
Gabon		21 Jan 1983 a
Gambia		29 Dec 1978 a
Georgia		11 Oct 1993 a
Germany[10,11]		24 Nov 1954 a
Ghana		24 Dec 1958 a
Greece	29 Dec 1949	8 Dec 1954
Guatemala	22 Jun 1949	13 Jan 1950
Guinea		7 Sep 2000 a
Haiti	11 Dec 1948	14 Oct 1950
Honduras	22 Apr 1949	5 Mar 1952
Hungary		7 Jan 1952 a
Iceland	14 May 1949	29 Aug 1949
India	29 Nov 1949	27 Aug 1959
Iran (Islamic Republic	8 Dec 1949	14 Aug 1956

Participant[2]	Signature	Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)
of)		
Iraq		20 Jan 1959 a
Ireland		22 Jun 1976 a
Israel	17 Aug 1949	9 Mar 1950
Italy		4 Jun 1952 a
Jamaica		23 Sep 1968 a
Jordan		3 Apr 1950 a
Kazakhstan		26 Aug 1998 a
Kuwait		7 Mar 1995 a
Kyrgyzstan		5 Sep 1997 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		8 Dec 1950 a
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 a
Lebanon	30 Dec 1949	17 Dec 1953
Lesotho		29 Nov 1974 a
Liberia	11 Dec 1948	9 Jun 1950
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 May 1989 a
Liechtenstein		24 Mar 1994 a
Lithuania		1 Feb 1996 a
Luxembourg		7 Oct 1981 a
Malaysia		20 Dec 1994 a
Maldives		24 Apr 1984 a
Mali		16 Jul 1974 a
Mexico	14 Dec 1948	22 Jul 1952
Monaco		30 Mar 1950 a
Mongolia		5 Jan 1967 a
Montenegro[12]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		24 Jan 1958 a
Mozambique		18 Apr 1983 a
Myanmar	30 Dec 1949	14 Mar 1956
Namibia		28 Nov 1994 a
Nepal		17 Jan 1969 a
Netherlands		20 Jun 1966 a
New Zealand[13]	25 Nov 1949	28 Dec 1978
Nicaragua		29 Jan 1952 a
Norway	11 Dec 1948	22 Jul 1949
Pakistan	11 Dec 1948	12 Oct 1957
Panama	11 Dec 1948	11 Jan 1950
Papua New Guinea		27 Jan 1982 a
Paraguay	11 Dec 1948	3 Oct 2001
Peru	11 Dec 1948	24 Feb 1960
Philippines	11 Dec 1948	7 Jul 1950
Poland		14 Nov 1950 a
Portugal[6]		9 Feb 1999 a
Republic of Korea		14 Oct 1950 a
Republic of Moldova		26 Jan 1993 a
Romania		2 Nov 1950 a
Russian Federation	16 Dec 1949	3 May 1954
Rwanda		16 Apr 1975 a
Saudi Arabia		13 Jul 1950 a
Senegal		4 Aug 1983 a
Serbia[3,14]		12 Mar 2001 a
Seychelles		5 May 1992 a
Singapore		18 Aug 1995 a
Slovakia[9]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[2]		6 Jul 1992 d
South Africa		10 Dec 1998 a
Spain		13 Sep 1968 a
Sri Lanka		12 Oct 1950 a
St. Vincent and the Grenadines		9 Nov 1981 a
Sudan		13 Oct 2003 a
Sweden	30 Dec 1949	27 May 1952
Switzerland		7 Sep 2000 a
Syrian Arab Republic		25 Jun 1955 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[2]		18 Jan 1994 d
Togo		24 May 1984 a
Tonga		16 Feb 1972 a
Trinidad and Tobago		13 Dec 2002 a
Tunisia		29 Nov 1956 a
Turkey		31 Jul 1950 a
Uganda		14 Nov 1995 a
Ukraine	16 Dec 1949	15 Nov 1954
United Arab Emirates		11 Nov 2005 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland		30 Jan 1970 a
United Republic of Tanzania		5 Apr 1984 a
United States of America	11 Dec 1948	25 Nov 1988
Uruguay	11 Dec 1948	11 Jul 1967
Uzbekistan		9 Sep 1999 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		12 Jul 1960 a
Viet Nam[15,16]		9 Jun 1981 a
Yemen		9 Feb 1987 a

Zimbabwe.................... 13 May 1991 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto and territorial applications see hereinafter.)

ALBANIA[17]

...

As regards article XII: The People's Republic of Albania declares that it is not in agreement with article XII of the Convention and considers that all the provisions of the Convention should extend to Non-Self-Governing Territories, including Trust Territories.

ALGERIA

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by article IX of the Convention, which confers on the International Court of Justice jurisdiction in all disputes relating to the said Convention.

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria declares that no provision of article VI of the said Convention shall be interpreted as depriving its tribunals of jurisdiction in cases of genocide or other acts enumerated in article III which have been committed in its territory or as conferring such jurisdiction on foreign tribunals.

International tribunals may, as an exceptional measure, be recognized as having jurisdiction, in cases in which the Algerian Government has given its express approval.

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria declares that it does not accept the terms of article XII of the Convention and considers that all the provisions of the said Convention should apply to Non-Self-Governing Territories, including Trust Territories.

ARGENTINA

Ad article IX: The Argentine Government reserves the right not to submit to the procedure laid down in this article any dispute relating directly or indirectly to the territories referred to in its reservation to article XII.

Ad article XII: If any other Contracting Party extends the application of the Convention to territories under the sovereignty of the Argentine Republic, this extension shall in no way affect the rights of the Republic.

BAHRAIN[18]

Reservations:

"With reference to article IX of the Convention the Government of the State of Bahrain declares that, for the submission of any dispute in terms of this article to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the express consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each case."

"Moreover, the accession by the State of Bahrain to the said Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith."

BANGLADESH

Declaration:

"Article IX: For the submission of any dispute in terms of this article to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the consent of all parties to the dispute will be required in each case."

BELARUS[19]

The Byelorussian SSR declares that it is not in agreement with article XII of the Convention and considers that all the provisions of the Convention should extend to non-self-governing territories, including trust territories.

BULGARIA[20]

As regards article XII: The People's Republic of Bulgaria declares that it is not in agreement with article XII of the Convention and considers that all the provisions of the Convention should extend to Non-Self-Governing Territories, including Trust Territories.

CHINA

Declaration:

1. The ratification to the said Convention by the Taiwan local authorities on 19 July 1951 in the name of China is illegal and therefore null and void.

Reservation:

2. The People's Republic of China does not consider itself bound by article IX of the said Convention.

CZECH REPUBLIC[9]

FINLAND[21]

HUNGARY[22]

The Hungarian People's Republic reserves its rights with regard to the provisions of article XII which do not define the obligations of countries having colonies with regard to questions of colonial exploitation and to acts which might be described as genocide.

INDIA

"With reference to article IX of the Convention, the Government of India declares that, for the submission of any dispute in terms of this article to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each case."

MALAYSIA[23]

Reservation:

"That with reference to article IX of the Convention, before any dispute to which Malaysia is a party may be submitted to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under this article, the specific consent of Malaysia is required in each case."

Understanding:

"That the pledge to grant extradition in accordance with a state's laws and treaties in force found in article VII extends only to acts which are criminal under the law of both the requesting and the requested state."

MONGOLIA[24]

The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic declares that it is not in a position to agree with article XII of the Convention and considers that the provisions of the said article should be extended to non-self-governing territories, including trust territories.

The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic deems it appropriate to draw attention to the discriminatory character of article XI of the Convention, under the terms of which a number of States are precluded from acceding to the Convention and declares that the Convention deals with matters which affect the interests of all States and it should, therefore, be open for accession by all States.

MONTENEGRO[12]

Confirmed upon succession:

Reservation:

"The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia does not consider itself bound by Article IX of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and, therefore, before any dispute to which the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is a party may be validly submitted to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under this Article, the specific and explicit consent of the FRY is required in each case."

MOROCCO

With reference to article VI, the Government of His Majesty the King considers that Moroccan courts and tribunals alone have jurisdiction with respect to acts of genocide committed within the territory of the Kingdom of Morocco.

The competence of international courts may be admitted exceptionally in cases with respect to which the Moroccan Government has given its specific agreement.

With reference to article IX, the Moroccan Government states that no dispute relating to the interpretation, application or fulfilment of the present Convention can be brought before the International Court of Justice, without the prior agreement of the parties to the dispute.

MYANMAR

"(1) With reference to article VI, the Union of Burma makes the reservation that nothing contained in the said Article shall be construed as depriving the Courts and Tribunals of the Union of jurisdiction or as giving foreign Courts and tribunals jurisdiction over any cases of genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in article III committed within the Union territory.

"(2) With reference to article VIII, the Union of Burma makes the reservation that the said article shall not apply to the Union."

PHILIPPINES

"1. With reference to article IV of the Convention, the Philippine Government cannot sanction any situation which would subject its Head of State, who is not a ruler, to conditions less favorable than those accorded other Heads of State, whether constitutionally responsible rulers or not. The Philippine Government does not consider said article, therefore, as overriding the existing immunities from judicial processes guaranteed certain public officials by the Constitution of the Philippines.

"2. With reference to article VII of the Convention, the Philippine Government does not undertake to give effect to said article until the Congress of the Philippines has enacted the necessary legislation defining and punishing the crime of genocide, which legislation, under the Constitution of the Philippines, cannot have any retroactive effect.

"3. With reference to articles VI and IX of the Convention, the Philippine Government takes the position that nothing contained in said articles shall be construed as depriving Philippine courts of jurisdiction over all cases of genocide committed within Philippine territory save only in those cases where the Philippine Government consents to have the decision of the Philippine courts reviewed by either of the international tribunals referred to in said articles. With further reference to article IX of the Convention, the Philippine Government does not consider said article to extend the concept of State responsibility beyond that recognized by the generally accepted principles of international law."

POLAND[25]

As regards article XII: Poland does not accept the provisions of this article, considering that the Convention should apply to Non-Self-Governing Territories, including Trust Territories.

ROMANIA[26]

As regards article XII: The People's Republic of Romania declares that it is not in agreement with article XII of the Convention, and considers that all the provisions of the Convention should apply to the Non-Self-Governing Territories, including the Trust Territories.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[19]

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that it is not in agreement with article XII of the Convention and considers that all the provisions of the Convention should extend to Non-Self-Governing Territories, including Trust Territories.

RWANDA[27]

SERBIA[14,28]

Reservation:

"The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia does not consider itself bound by Article IX of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and, therefore, before any dispute to which the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is a party may be validly submitted to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under this Article, the specific and explicit consent of the FRY is required in each case."

SINGAPORE[23]

Reservation:

"That with reference to article IX of the Convention, before any dispute to which the Republic of Singapore is a party may be submitted to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under this article, the specific consent of the Republic of Singapore is required in each case."

SLOVAKIA[9]

SPAIN

With a reservation in respect of the whole of article IX (jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice).

UKRAINE[19]

The Ukrainian SSR declares that it is not in agreement with article XII of the Convention and considers that all the provisions of the Convention should extend to Non-Self-Governing Territories, including Trust Territories.

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

Reservation:

The Government of the State of the United Arab Emirates, having considered the aforementioned Convention and approved the contents thereof, formally declares its accession to the Convention and makes a reservation with respect to article 9 thereof concerning the submission of disputes arising between the Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation, application or fulfilment of this Convention, to the International Court of Justice, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA[29]

Reservations:

"(1) That with reference to article IX of the Convention, be fore any dispute to which the United States is a party may be submitted to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under this article, the specific consent of the United States is required in each case.

(2) That nothing in the Convention requires or authorizes legislation or other action by the United States of America prohibited by the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the United States."

Understandings:

"(1) That the term `intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group as such' appearing in article II means the specific intent to destroy, in whole or in substantial part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group as such by the acts specified in article II.

(2) That the term `mental harm' in article II (b) means permanent impairment of mental faculties through drugs, torture or similar techniques.

(3) That the pledge to grant extradition in accordance with a state's laws and treaties in force found in article VII extends only to acts which are criminal under the laws of both the requesting and the requested state and nothing in article VI affects the right of any state to bring to trial before its own tribunals any of its nationals for acts committed outside a state.

(4) That acts in the course of armed conflicts committed without the specific intent required by article II are not sufficient to constitute genocide as defined by this Convention.

(5) That with regard to the reference to an international penal tribunal in article VI of the Convention, the United States declares that it reserves the right to effect its participation in any such tribunal only by a treaty entered into specifically for that purpose with the advice and consent of the Senate."

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

With reference to article VI, notice is given that any proceedings to which Venezuela may be a party before an international penal tribunal would be invalid without Venezuela's prior express acceptance of the jurisdiction of such international tribunal.

With reference to article VII, notice is given that the laws in force in Venezuela do not permit the extradition of Venezuelan nationals.

With reference to article IX, the reservation is made that the submission of a dispute to the International Court of Justice shall be regarded as valid only when it takes place with Venezuela's approval, signified by the express conclusion of a prior agreement in each case.

VIET NAM

1. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam does not consider itself bound by article IX of the Convention which provides the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in solving disputes between the Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation, application or fulfilment of the Convention at the request of any of the parties to disputes. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam is of the view that, regarding the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in solving disputes referred to in article IX of the Convention, the consent of the parties to the disputes except the criminals is diametrically necessary for the submission of a given dispute to the International Court of Justice for decision.

2. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam does not accept article XII of the Convention and considers that all provisions of the Convention should also extend to Non-Self-Governing Territories, including Trust Territories.

3. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam considers that article XI is of a discriminatory nature, depriving a number of States of the opportunity to become parties to the Convention, and holds that the Convention should be open for accession by all States.

YEMEN[30]

In acceding to this Convention, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen does not consider itself bound by article IX of the Convention, which provides that disputes between the Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation, application or fulfilment of the Convention shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice at the request of any of the parties to the dispute. It declares that the competence of the International Court of Justice with respect to disputes concerning the interpretation, application or fulfilment of the Convention shall in each case be subject to the express consent of all parties to the dispute.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRALIA

15 November 1950

"The Australian Government does not accept any of the reservations contained in the instrument of accession of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, or in the instrument of ratification of the Republic of the Philippines.

"The Australian Government does not accept any of the reservations made at the time of signature of the Convention by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

19 January 1951

"The Australian Government does not accept the reservations contained in the instruments of accession of the Governments of Poland and Romania."

BELGIUM

The Government of Belgium does not accept the reservations made by Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

BRAZIL[31,32]

The Government of Brazil objects to the reservations made to the Convention by Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the Philippines, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The Brazilian Government considers the said reservations as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The position taken by the Government of Brazil is founded on the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice of 28 May 1951 and on the resolution adopted by the sixth session of the General Assembly on 12 January 1952, on reservations to multilateral conventions.

The Brazilian Government reserves the right to draw any such legal consequences as it may deem fit from its formal objection to the above-mentioned reservations.

CHINA[31]

15 November 1954

"The Government of China ... objects to all the identical reservations made at the time of signature or ratification or accession to the Convention by Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The Chinese Government considers the above-mentioned reservations as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and, therefore, by virtue of the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice of 28 May 1951, would not regard the above-mentioned States as being Parties to the Convention."

13 September 1955

[Same communication, mutatis mutandis, in respect of the reservations made by Albania.]

25 July 1956

[Same communication, mutatis mutandis, in respect of the reservations made by Myanmar.]

CUBA[7]

DENMARK

27 December 1989

With regard to reservation (2) made by the United States of America:

"In the view of the Government of Denmark this reservation is subject to general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform a treaty."

ECUADOR

31 March 1950

The Government of is not in agreement with the reservations made to article IX and XII of the Convention by the Governments of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and, therefore, they do not apply to Ecuador which accepted without any modifications the integral text of the Convention.

21 August 1950

[Same communication, mutatis mutandis, in respect of the reservations made by Bulgaria.]

9 January 1951

The Government of Ecuador does not accept the reservations made by the Governments of Poland and Romania to articles IX and XII of the Convention.

ESTONIA

With regard to reservation (2) made by the United States of America:

"The Estonian Government objects to this reservation on the grounds that it creates uncertainty, as to the extent of the obligations the Government of the United States of America is prepared to assume with regard to the Convention. According to article 27 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, no party may invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for failure to perform a treaty."

FINLAND

22 December 1989

With respect to reservation (2) made by the United States of America:

"In the view of the Government of Finland this reservation is subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform a treaty."

GREECE

We further declare that we have not accepted and do not accept any reservation which has already been made or which may hereafter be made by the countries signatory to this instrument or by countries which have acceded or may hereafter accede thereto.

26 January 1990

The Government of the Hellenic Republic cannot accept the first reservation entered by the United States of America upon ratifying the Agreement on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, for it considers such a reservation to be in compatible with the Convention.

In respect of the second reservation formulated by the United States of America:

[Same objection mutatis mutandis, as the one made by Denmark.]

IRELAND

22 December 1989

"The Government of Ireland is unable to accept the second reservation made by the United States of America on the occasion of its ratification of the [said] Convention on the grounds that as a generally accepted rule of international law a party to an international agreement may not, by invoking the terms of its internal law, purport to override the provisions of the Agreement."

ITALY

29 December 1989

The Government of the Republic of Italy objects to the second reservation entered by the United States of America. It creates uncertainty as to the extent of the obligations which the Government of the United States of America is prepared to assume with regard to the Convention."

MEXICO

4 June 1990

The Government of Mexico believes that the reservation made by the United States Government to article IX of the aforesaid Convention should be considered invalid because it is not in keeping with the object and purpose of the Convention, nor with the principle governing the interpretation of treaties whereby no State can invoke provisions of its domestic law as a reason for not complying with a treaty.

If the aforementioned reservation were applied, it would give rise to a situation of uncertainty as to the scope of the obligations which the United States Government would assume with respect to the Convention.

Mexico's objection to the reservation in question should not be interpreted as preventing the entry into force of the 1948 Convention between the [Mexican] Government and the United States Government.

NETHERLANDS

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands declares that it considers the reservations made by Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, India, Morocco, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in respect of article IX of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, opened for signature at Paris on 9 December 1948, to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore does not deem any State which has made or which will make such reservation a party to the Convention."

27 December 1989

With regard to the reservations made by the United States of America:

"As concerns the first reservation, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls its declaration, made on 20 June 1966 on the occasion of the accession of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the Convention [...] stating that in its opinion the reservations in respect of article IX of the Convention, made at that time by a number of states, were incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, and that the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands did not consider states making such reservations parties to the Convention. Accordingly, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands does not consider the United States of America a party to the Convention. Similarly, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands does not consider parties to the Convention other states which have made such reservations, i.e., in addition to the states mentioned in the aforementioned declaration, the People's Republic of China, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Philippines, Rwanda, Spain, Venezuela, and Viet Nam, on the other hand, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands does consider parties to theConvention those states that have since withdrawn their reservations, i.e., the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

As the Convention may come into force between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the United States of America as a result of the latter withdrawing its reservation in respect of article IX, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands deems it useful to express the following position on the second reservation of the United States of America:

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to this reservation on the ground that it creates uncertainty as to the extent of the obligations the Government of the United States of America is prepared to assume with regard to the Convention. Moreover, any failure by the United States of America to act upon the obligations contained in the Convention on the ground that such action would be prohibited by the constitution of the United States would be contrary to the generally accepted rule of international law, as laid down in article 27 of the Vienna Convention on the law of treaties (Vienna, 23 May 1969)".

23 February 1996

With regard to the reservations made by Malaysia and Singapore made upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls its declaration made on 20 June 1966 on the occasion of the accession [to the said Convention].

[See declaration made under " ***Netherlands*** *"]*

Accordingly, the Government of the Netherlands declares that it considers the reservations made by Malaysia and Singapore in respect of article IX of the Convention incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands does not consider Malaysia and Singapore Parties to the Convention.

On the other hand, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands does consider Parties to the Convention those States that have since withdrawn their reservations in respect of article IX of the Convention, i.e., Hungary, Bulgaria and Mongolia."

NORWAY

10 April 1952

"The Norwegian Government does not accept the reservations made to the Convention by the Government of the Philippines at the time of ratification."

22 December 1989

With regard to reservation (2) made by the United States of America:

"In the view of the Government of Norway this reservation is subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform a treaty."

SPAIN

29 December 1989

With regard to reservation (2) made by the United States of America:

Spain interprets the reservation entered by the United States of America to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 9 December 1948 [...] to mean that legislation or other action by the United States of America will continue to be in accordance with the provisions of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

SRI LANKA

6 February 1951

"The Government of Ceylon does not accept the reservations made by Romania to the Convention."

SWEDEN

22 December 1989

With regard to reservation (2) made by the United States of America:

"The Government of Sweden is of the view that a State party to the Convention may not invoke the provisions of its national legislation, including the Constitution, to justify that it does not fulfil its obligations under the Convention and therefore objects to the reservation.

This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Sweden and the United States of America."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"The Government of the United Kingdom do not accept the reservations to articles IV, VII, VIII, IX or XII of the Convention made by Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bulgaria, Burma, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, India, Mongolia, Morocco, the Philippines, Poland, Romania, Spain, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or Venezuela."

21 November 1975

" The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have consistently stated that they are unable to accept reservations in respect of article IX of the said Convention; in their view this is not the kind of reservation which intending parties to the Convention have the right to make.

Accordingly, the Government of the United Kingdom do not accept the reservation entered by the Republic of Rwanda against article IX of the Convention. They also wish to place on record that they take the same view of the similar reservation made by the German Democratic Republic as notified by the circular letter [...] of 25 April 1973."

26 August 1983

With regard to statements made by Viet Nam concerning articles IX and XII and reservation made by China concerning article IX:

"The Government of the United Kingdom have [...] consistently stated that they are unable to accept reservations to [article IX]. Likewise, in conformity with the attitude adopted by them in previous cases, the Government of the United Kingdom do not accept the reservation entered by Viet Nam relating to article XII."

30 December 1987

With regard to a reservation made by Democratic Yemen concerning article IX:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have consistently stated that they are unable to accept reservations in respect of article IX of the said Convention; in their view this is not the kind of reservation which intending parties to the Convention hve the right to make.

Accordingly the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland do not accept the reservation entered by the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen against article IX of the Convention."

22 December 1989

"The Government of the United Kingdom have consistently stated that they are unable to accept reservations to article IX. Accordingly, in conformity with the attitude adopted by them in previous cases, the Government of the United Kingdom do not accept the first reservation entered by the United States of America.

The Government of the United Kingdom object to the second reservation entered by the United States of America. It creates uncertainty as to the extent of the obligations which the Government of the United States of America is prepared to assume with regard to the Convention."

20 March 1996

With regard to reservations to article IX made by Malaysia and Singapore upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have consistently stated that they are unable to accept reservations to article IX. In their view, these are not the kind of reservations which intending parties to the Convention have the right to make.

Accordingly, the Government of the United Kingdom do not accept the reservations entered by the Government of Singapore and Malaysia to article IX of the Convention."

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Australia	8 Jul 1949	All Overseas Territories of Australia
Belgium	13 Mar 1952	Belgian Congo and Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[4,33]	2 Jun 1970	Bahamas, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Channel Islands, Dominica, Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and Dependencies, Fiji, Gibraltar, Grenada, Hong Kong, Isle of Man, Pitcairn Island, St. Helena and Dependencies, St. Lucia, Seychelles, St. Vincent and Turks and Caicos Islands
	2 Jun 1970	Tonga

Notes:

[1] Resolution 260 (III), *Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session* , Part I (A/810), p. 174.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 11 December 1948 and 29 August 1950, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The following communication, received by the Secretary-General on 15 June 1993, was transmitted prior to Yugoslavia's admission to membership in the United Nations by General Assembly resolution A/55/12 on 1 November 2000, and its accession to the Convention, deposited with the Secretary-General on 12 March 2001:

"Considering the fact that the replacement of sovereignty on the part of the territory of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia previously comprising the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina was carried out contrary to the rules of international law, the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia herewith states that it does not consider the so-called Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina a party to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, but does consider that the so-called Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina is bound by the obligation to respect the norms on preventing and punishing the crime of genocide in accordance with general international law irrespective of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

See also note 2 in this chapter and note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] On 6 and 10 June 1997, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from the Governments of the United Kingdom and China (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with the reservation made by China will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

[5] Ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 19 July 1951. See note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] On 16 September 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General that the Convention would apply to Macao. Subsequently, the Secretary-General received communications regarding the status of Macao from Portugal and China (see note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portgual" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with the reservation made by China will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[7] By a notification received by the Secretary-General on 29 January 1982, the Government of Cuba withdrew the declaration made on its behalf upon ratification of the said Convention with respect to the reservations to articles IX and XII by Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

[8] On 18 May 1998, the Government of Cyprus notified the Secretary-General of the following:

"The Government of the Republic of Cyprus has taken note of the reservations made by a number of countries when acceding to the [Convention] and wishes to state that in its view these are not the kind of reservations which intending parties to the Convention have the right to make.

Accordingly, the Government of the Republic of Cyprus does not accept any reservations entered by any Government with regard to any of the Articles of the Convention."

[9] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 28 December 1949 and 21 December 1950, respectively, with a reservation. Subsequently, by a notification received on 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to article IX made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 78, p. 303. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume

[10] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[11] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention with reservation and declaration on 27 March 1973. For the text of the reservation and the declarations see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 861, p. 200. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[12] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[13] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[14] The Secretary-General received communications from the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter regarding the accession of Yugoslavia to the Convention:

Croatia (18 May 2001):

"The Government of the Republic of Croatia objects to the deposition of the instrument of accession of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, due to the fact that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is already bound by the Convention since its emergence as one of the five equal successor states to the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

This fact was confirmed by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in its Declaration of 27 April 1992, as communicated to the Secretary-General (UN doc. A/46/915). Notwithstanding the political reasoning behind it, in its 1992 Declaration the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia stated that it "shall strictly abide by all the commitments that the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia assumed internationally".

In this regard the Republic of Croatia notes in particular the decision of the International Court of Justice in its Judgement of 11 July 1996 that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia "was bound by provisions of the [Genocide] Convention on the date of the filing of [the Application by Bosnia and Herzegovina], namely on 20 March 1993" (ICJ Reports 1996, p. 595, at para. 17).

The Government of the Republic of Croatia further objects to the reservation made by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in respect of Article IX of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, and considers it to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of the Republic of Croatia considers the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide to be fully in force and applicable between the Republic of Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, including Article IX.

The Government of the Republi of Croatia deems that neither the purported way of becoming a party to the Genocide Convention *ex nunc* by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, nor its purported reservation, have any legal effect regarding the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice with respect to the pending proceedings initiated before the International Court of Justice by the Republic of Croatia against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia pursuant to the Genocide Convention."

Bosnia-Herzegovina (27 December 2001):

On 21 March 2001 the Secretary-General of the United Nations confirmed to the Permanent Representative of Yugoslavia to the United Nations the receipt of a 'Notification of Accession to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948). The note of the Secretary -General carries reference as: LA 41 TR/221/1(4-1).

The Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina objects to the deposition of this instrument of accession.

On 29 June 2001, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia, the Republic of Macedonia, the Republic of Slovenia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia signed an "Agreement on Succession Issues" in which these States, among other things, declare that they are "in sovereign equality the five successor States to the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia". A copy of the Agreement is enclosed. *[Copy not reproduced herein.]* For this reason, there can e no question of "accession", but rather there is an issue of succession. This, in itself, implies that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has effectively succeeded the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia as of 27 April 1992 (the date of the proclamation of the FRY) as a Party to the Genocide Convention.

Apart from that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia upon its proclamation on 27 April 1992 declared - and communicated this to the Secretary-General that it would "strictly abide by all the commitments that the Socialist Federal Republic of Yuslavia assumed internationally"(UN Doc. A/46/915).

For these two reasons it is not possible for the FRY to effectively lay down a reservation with regards to part of the Genocide Convention (i.e. Article IX of the Convention) several years after 27 April 1992, the day on which FRY became bound to the Genocide Convention in its entirety. Bosnia and Herzegovina refers to Articles 2 (1) (d) and 19 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which explicitly states that a reservation may only be formulated "when signing, ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to a treaty".

The Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina therefore deems the so-called "Notification of Accession to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948)" submitted by the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to be null and void. Moreover, the International Court of Justice declared in its Judgement of 11 July 1996, "Yugoslavia was bound by the provisions of the Convention" at least at the date of the filing of the Application in the case introduced by Bosnia and Herzegovina on 20 March 1993/ICJ Rep. 1996, p.610, para. 17). The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia continues to be bound under the same conditions, that is without any reservation."

[15] The Secretary-General received on 9 November 1981 from the Government of the Democratic Republic of Kampuchea the following objection with regard to the accession by Viet Nam:

The Government of Democratic Kampuchea, as a party to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, considers that the signing of that Convention by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam has no legal force, because it is no more than a cynical, macabre charade intended to camouflage the foul crimes of genocide committed by the 250,000 soldiers of the Vietnamese invasion army in Kampuchea. It is an odious insult to the memory of the more than 2,500,000 Kampucheans who have been massacred by these same Vietnamese armed forces using conventional weapons, chemical weapons and the weapon of famine, created deliberately by them for the purpose of eliminating all national resistance at its source.

It is also a gross insult to hundreds of thousands of Laotians who have been massacred or compelled to take refuge abroad since the occupation of Laos by the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, to the Hmong national minority in Laos, exterminated by Vietnamese conventional and chemical weapons and, finally, to over a million Vietnamese "boat people" who died at sea or sought refuge abroad in their flight to escape the repression carried out in Viet Nam by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam.

This shameless accession by the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam violates and discredits the noble principles and ideals of the United Nations and jeopardizes the prestige and moral authority of our world Organization. It represents an arrogant challenge to the international community, which is well aware of these crimes of genocide committed by the Vietnamese army in Kampuchea, has constantly denounced and condemned them since 25 December 1978, the date on which the Vietnamese invasion of Kampuchea began, and demands that these Vietnamese crimes of genocideght to an end by the total withdrawal of the Vietnamese forces from Kampuchea and the restoration of the inalienable right of the people of Kampuchea to decide its own destiny without any foreign interference, as provided in United Nations resolutions 34/22, 35/6 and 36/5.

[16] Accession on behalf of the Republic of Viet-Nam on 11 August 1950. (For the text of objections to some of the reservations made upon the said accession, see publication, *Multilateral Treaties for which the Secretary-General acts as Depositary* (ST/LEG/SER.D/13, p. 91). See also note 1 under "Viet Nam" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[17] On 19 July 1999, the Government of Albania informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation regarding article IX made upon accession. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 210, p. 332.

[18] On 25 June 1990, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel the following objection:

"The Government of the State of Israel has noted that the instrument of accession of Bahrain to the [said] Convention contains a declaration in respect of Israel.

In the view of the Government of the State of Israel, such declaration, which is explicitly of a political character, is incompatible with the purpose and objectives of this Convention and cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Bahrain under general International Law or under particular Conventions.

The Government of the State of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards Bahrain an attitude of complete reciprocity".

[19] In communications received on 8 March, 19 and 20 April 1989, respectively, the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic notified the Secretary-General that they had decided to withdraw the reservation relating to article IX. For the texts of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 190, p. 381, vol.196, p. 345 and vol. 201, p. 368, respectively.

[20] On 24 June 1992, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw the reservation to article IX of the Convention, made upon accession. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 78, p. 318.

[21] On 5 January 1998, the Government of Finland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation made upon accession to the Convention. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 346, p. 324.

[22] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation relating to article IX made upon accession. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 118, p. 306.

[23] In this regard, on 14 October 1996, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Norway, the following communication:

"... In [the view of the Government of Norway], reservations in respect of article IX of the Convention are incompatible with the object and purpose of the said Convention. Accordingly, the Government of Norway does not accept the reservations entered by the Governments of Singapore and Malaysia to article IX of the Convention."

[24] In a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation relating to article IX made upon accession. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 587, p. 326.

[25] On 16 October 1997, the Government of Poland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with regard to article IX of the Convention made upon accession. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 78, p. 277.

[26] On 2 April 1997, the Government of Romania informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with regard to article IX of the Convention. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 78, p. 314.

[27] In a communication received on 15 December 2008, the Government of Rwanda notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation relating to article IX made upon accession to the Convention. The text of the reservation reads as follows:

The Rwandese Republic does not consider itself as bound by article IX of the Convention.

[28] With regard to the reservation made by the Government of Yugoslavia upon accession, the Secretary-General received from the following State, a communication on the date indicated hereinafter:

Sweden (2 April 2002):

"The Government of Sweden has taken note of the Secretary-General's circular notification 164.2001.TREATIES-.1 of 15 March 2001, stating the intent of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to accede, with a reservation, to the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. The Government of Sweden regards the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia as one successor state to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and, as such, a Party to the Convention from the date of the entering into force of the Convention for the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The Government of Sweden hereby communicates that it considers the said reservation as having been made too late, according to article 19 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, and thus null and void."

[29] On 11 January 1990, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany the following declaration:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has taken note of the declarations made under the heading "Reservations" by the Government of the United States of America upon ratification of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 9 December 1948. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany interprets paragraph (2) of the said declarations as a reference to article V of the Convention and therefore as not in any way affecting the obligations of the United States of America as a State Party to the Convention.".

[30] The Yemen Arab Republic had acceded to the Convention

on 6 April 1989. See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[31] For the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice of 28 May 1951, see *I.C.J., Report 1951*, p. 15.

[32] For the resolution adopted on 12 January 1952 by the sixth session of the General Assembly concerning reservations to multilateral conventions, see Resolution 598 (VI); *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Supplement No. 20 (A/2119)*, p. 84.

[33] On 3 October 1983, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following objection:

[The Government of Argentina makes a] formal objection to the declaration of territorial extension issued by the United Kingdom with regard to the Malvinas Islands (and dependencies), which that country is illegally occupying and refers to as the "Falkland Islands". The Argentine Republic rejects and considers null and void the [said declaration] of territorial extension.

With reference to the above-mentioned objection the Secretary-General received, on 28 February 1985, from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following declaration:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to their right, by notification to the Depositary under the relevant provisions of the above-mentioned Convention, to extend the application of the Convention in question to the Falkland Islands or to the Falkland Islands Dependencies, as the case may be.

For this reason alone, the Government of the United Kingdom are unable to regard the Argentine [communication] under reference as having any legal effect."

2. INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

New York, 7 March 1966

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 4 January 1969, in accordance with article 19.[1]
REGISTRATION: 12 March 1969, No. 9464.
STATUS: Signatories: 85. Parties: 173.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 660, p. 195.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 2106 (XX)[2] of 21 December 1965.

Participant[3]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Afghanistan		6 Jul 1983 a
Albania		11 May 1994 a
Algeria	9 Dec 1966	14 Feb 1972
Andorra	5 Aug 2002	22 Sep 2006
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 d
Argentina	13 Jul 1967	2 Oct 1968
Armenia		23 Jun 1993 a
Australia	13 Oct 1966	30 Sep 1975
Austria	22 Jul 1969	9 May 1972
Azerbaijan		16 Aug 1996 a
Bahamas		5 Aug 1975 d
Bahrain		27 Mar 1990 a
Bangladesh		11 Jun 1979 a
Barbados		8 Nov 1972 a
Belarus	7 Mar 1966	8 Apr 1969
Belgium	17 Aug 1967	7 Aug 1975
Belize	6 Sep 2000	14 Nov 2001
Benin	2 Feb 1967	30 Nov 2001
Bhutan	26 Mar 1973	
Bolivia	7 Jun 1966	22 Sep 1970
Bosnia and Herzegovina[4]		16 Jul 1993 d
Botswana		20 Feb 1974 a
Brazil	7 Mar 1966	27 Mar 1968
Bulgaria	1 Jun 1966	8 Aug 1966
Burkina Faso		18 Jul 1974 a
Burundi	1 Feb 1967	27 Oct 1977
Cambodia	12 Apr 1966	28 Nov 1983
Cameroon	12 Dec 1966	24 Jun 1971
Canada	24 Aug 1966	14 Oct 1970
Cape Verde		3 Oct 1979 a
Central African Republic	7 Mar 1966	16 Mar 1971
Chad		17 Aug 1977 a
Chile	3 Oct 1966	20 Oct 1971
China		29 Dec 1981 a
Colombia	23 Mar 1967	2 Sep 1981
Comoros	22 Sep 2000	27 Sep 2004
Congo		11 Jul 1988 a
Costa Rica	14 Mar 1966	16 Jan 1967
Côte d'Ivoire		4 Jan 1973 a
Croatia[4]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba	7 Jun 1966	15 Feb 1972
Cyprus	12 Dec 1966	21 Apr 1967
Czech Republic[5]		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic Republic of the Congo		21 Apr 1976 a
Denmark[6]	21 Jun 1966	9 Dec 1971
Djibouti	14 Jun 2006	
Dominican Republic		25 May 1983 a
Ecuador		22 Sep 1966 a
Egypt	28 Sep 1966	1 May 1967
El Salvador		30 Nov 1979 a
Equatorial Guinea		8 Oct 2002 a
Eritrea		31 Jul 2001 a
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Ethiopia		23 Jun 1976 a
Fiji		11 Jan 1973 d
Finland	6 Oct 1966	14 Jul 1970
France		28 Jul 1971 a
Gabon	20 Sep 1966	29 Feb 1980
Gambia		29 Dec 1978 a
Georgia		2 Jun 1999 a
Germany[7]	10 Feb 1967	16 May 1969
Ghana	8 Sep 1966	8 Sep 1966
Greece	7 Mar 1966	18 Jun 1970
Grenada	17 Dec 1981	
Guatemala	8 Sep 1967	18 Jan 1983

Participant[3]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Guinea	24 Mar 1966	14 Mar 1977
Guinea-Bissau	12 Sep 2000	
Guyana	11 Dec 1968	15 Feb 1977
Haiti	30 Oct 1972	19 Dec 1972
Holy See	21 Nov 1966	1 May 1969
Honduras		10 Oct 2002 a
Hungary	15 Sep 1966	4 May 1967
Iceland	14 Nov 1966	13 Mar 1967
India	2 Mar 1967	3 Dec 1968
Indonesia		25 Jun 1999 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	8 Mar 1967	29 Aug 1968
Iraq	18 Feb 1969	14 Jan 1970
Ireland	21 Mar 1968	29 Dec 2000
Israel	7 Mar 1966	3 Jan 1979
Italy	13 Mar 1968	5 Jan 1976
Jamaica	14 Aug 1966	4 Jun 1971
Japan		15 Dec 1995 a
Jordan		30 May 1974 a
Kazakhstan		26 Aug 1998 a
Kenya		13 Sep 2001 a
Kuwait		15 Oct 1968 a
Kyrgyzstan		5 Sep 1997 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		22 Feb 1974 a
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 a
Lebanon		12 Nov 1971 a
Lesotho		4 Nov 1971 a
Liberia		5 Nov 1976 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		3 Jul 1968 a
Liechtenstein		1 Mar 2000 a
Lithuania	8 Jun 1998	10 Dec 1998
Luxembourg	12 Dec 1967	1 May 1978
Madagascar	18 Dec 1967	7 Feb 1969
Malawi		11 Jun 1996 a
Maldives		24 Apr 1984 a
Mali		16 Jul 1974 a
Malta	5 Sep 1968	27 May 1971
Mauritania	21 Dec 1966	13 Dec 1988
Mauritius		30 May 1972 a
Mexico	1 Nov 1966	20 Feb 1975
Monaco		27 Sep 1995 a
Mongolia	3 May 1966	6 Aug 1969

Participant[3]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Montenegro[8]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	18 Sep 1967	18 Dec 1970
Mozambique		18 Apr 1983 a
Namibia[9]		11 Nov 1982 a
Nauru	12 Nov 2001	
Nepal		30 Jan 1971 a
Netherlands	24 Oct 1966	10 Dec 1971
New Zealand[10]	25 Oct 1966	22 Nov 1972
Nicaragua		15 Feb 1978 a
Niger	14 Mar 1966	27 Apr 1967
Nigeria		16 Oct 1967 a
Norway	21 Nov 1966	6 Aug 1970
Oman		2 Jan 2003 a
Pakistan	19 Sep 1966	21 Sep 1966
Panama	8 Dec 1966	16 Aug 1967
Papua New Guinea		27 Jan 1982 a
Paraguay	13 Sep 2000	18 Aug 2003
Peru	22 Jul 1966	29 Sep 1971
Philippines	7 Mar 1966	15 Sep 1967
Poland	7 Mar 1966	5 Dec 1968
Portugal[11]		24 Aug 1982 a
Qatar		22 Jul 1976 a
Republic of Korea	8 Aug 1978	5 Dec 1978
Republic of Moldova		26 Jan 1993 a
Romania		15 Sep 1970 a
Russian Federation	7 Mar 1966	4 Feb 1969
Rwanda		16 Apr 1975 a
San Marino	11 Dec 2001	12 Mar 2002
Sao Tome and Principe	6 Sep 2000	
Saudi Arabia		23 Sep 1997 a
Senegal	22 Jul 1968	19 Apr 1972
Serbia[4]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		7 Mar 1978 a
Sierra Leone	17 Nov 1966	2 Aug 1967
Slovakia[5]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[4]		6 Jul 1992 d
Solomon Islands		17 Mar 1982 d
Somalia	26 Jan 1967	26 Aug 1975
South Africa	3 Oct 1994	10 Dec 1998
Spain		13 Sep 1968 a
Sri Lanka		18 Feb 1982 a
St. Kitts and Nevis		13 Oct 2006 a
St. Lucia		14 Feb 1990 d
St. Vincent and the		9 Nov 1981 a

***Participant*[3]**	***Signature***	***Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)***
Grenadines		
Sudan		21 Mar 1977 a
Suriname		15 Mar 1984 d
Swaziland		7 Apr 1969 a
Sweden	5 May 1966	6 Dec 1971
Switzerland		29 Nov 1994 a
Syrian Arab Republic		21 Apr 1969 a
Tajikistan		11 Jan 1995 a
Thailand		28 Jan 2003 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[4]		18 Jan 1994 d
Timor-Leste		16 Apr 2003 a
Togo		1 Sep 1972 a
Tonga		16 Feb 1972 a
Trinidad and Tobago	9 Jun 1967	4 Oct 1973
Tunisia	12 Apr 1966	13 Jan 1967
Turkey	13 Oct 1972	16 Sep 2002
Turkmenistan		29 Sep 1994 a
Uganda		21 Nov 1980 a
Ukraine	7 Mar 1966	7 Mar 1969
United Arab Emirates		20 Jun 1974 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[12,13]	11 Oct 1966	7 Mar 1969
United Republic of Tanzania		27 Oct 1972 a
United States of America	28 Sep 1966	21 Oct 1994
Uruguay	21 Feb 1967	30 Aug 1968
Uzbekistan		28 Sep 1995 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	21 Apr 1967	10 Oct 1967
Viet Nam		9 Jun 1982 a
Yemen[14]		18 Oct 1972 a
Zambia	11 Oct 1968	4 Feb 1972
Zimbabwe		13 May 1991 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.
For objections thereto and declarations recognizing the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, see hereinafter.)

AFGHANISTAN

Reservation:

While acceding to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention since according to this article, in the event of disagreement between two or several States Parties to the Convention on the interpretation and implementation of provisions of the Convention, the matters could be referred to the International Court of Justice upon the request of only one side.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, therefore, states that should any disagreement emerge on the interpretation and implementation of the Convention, the matter will be referred to the International Court of Justice only if all concerned parties agree with that procedure.

Declaration:

Furthermore, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan states that the provisions of articles 17 and 18 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination have a discriminatory nature against some states and therefore are not in conformity with the principle of universality of international treaties.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA

Declaration:

"The Constitution of Antigua and Barbuda entrenches and guarantees to every person in Antigua and Barbuda the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual irrespective of race or place of origin. The Constitution prescribes judicial processes to be observed in the event of the violation of any of these rights, whether by the state or by a private individual. Acceptance of the Convention by the Government of Antigua and Barbuda does not imply the acceptance of obligations going beyond the constitutional limits nor the acceptance of any obligations to introduce judicial processes beyond those provided in the Constitution.

The Government of Antigua and Barbuda interprets article 4 of the Convention as requiring a Party to enact measures in the fields covered by subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only where it is considered that the need arises to enact such legislation."

AUSTRALIA

"The Government of Australia ... declares that Australia is not at present in a position specifically to treat as offences all the matters covered by article 4 (a) of the Convention. Acts of the kind there mentioned are punishable only to the extent provided by the existing criminal law dealing with such matters as the maintenance of public order, public mischief, assault, riot, criminal libel, conspiracy and attempts. It is the intention of the Australian Government, at the first suitable moment, to seek from Parliament legislation specifically implementing the terms of article 4 (a)."

AUSTRIA

"Article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination provides that the measures specifically described in sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) shall be undertaken with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5 of the Convention. The Republic of Austria therefore considers that through such measures the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association may not be jeopardized. These rights are laid down in articles 19 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; they were reaffirmed by the General Assembly of the United Nations when it adopted articles 19 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and are referred to in article 5 (d) (viii) and (ix) of the present Convention."

BAHAMAS

"Firstly the Government of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas wishes to state its understanding of article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. It interprets article 4 as requiring a party to the Convention to adopt further legislative measures in the fields covered by subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only in so far as it may consider with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration set out in article 5 of the Convention (in particular to freedom of opinion and expression and the right of freedom of peaceful assembly and association) that some legislative addition to, or variation of existing law and practice in these fields is necessary for the attainment of the ends specified in article 4. Lastly, the Constitution of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas entrenches and guarantees to every person in the Commonwealth of the Bahamas the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual irrespective of his race or place of origin. The Constitution prescribes judicial process to be observed in the event of the violation of any of these rights whether by the State or by a private individual. Acceptance of this Convention by the Commonwealth of the Bahamas does not imply the acceptance of obligations going beyond the constitutional limits nor the acceptance of any obligations to introduce judicial process beyond these prescribed under the Constitution."

BAHRAIN[15]

Reservations:

"With reference to article 22 of the Convention, the Government of the State of Bahrain declares that, for the submission of any dispute in terms of this article to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the express consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each case."

"Moreover, the accession by the State of Bahrain to the said Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith."

BARBADOS

"The Constitution of Barbados entrenches and guarantees to every person in Barbados the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual irrespective of his race or place of origin. The Constitution prescribes judicial processes to be observed in the event of the violation of any of these rights whether by the State or by a private individual. Accession to the Convention does not imply the acceptance of obligations going beyond the constitutional limits nor the acceptance of any obligations to introduce judicial processes beyond those provided in the Constitution.

The Government of Barbados interprets article 4 of the said Convention as requiring a Party to the Convention to enact measures in the fields covered by sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only where it is considered that the need arises to enact such legislation."

BELARUS[16]

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic states that the provision in article 17, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination whereby a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become Parties to the Convention is of a discriminatory nature, and hold that, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the Convention should be open to participation by all interested States without discrimination or restriction of any kind.

BELGIUM

In order to meet the requirements of article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Kingdom of Belgium will take care to adapt its legislation to the obligations it has assumed in becoming a party to the said Convention.

The Kingdom of Belgium nevertheless wishes to emphasize the importance which it attaches to the fact that article 4 of the Convention provides that the measures laid down in subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) should be adopted with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5 of the Convention. The Kingdom of Belgium therefore considers that the obligations imposed by article 4 must be reconciled with the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association. Those rights are proclaimed in articles 19 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and have been reaffirmed in articles 19 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. They have also been stated in article 5, subparagraph (d) (viii) and (ix) of the said Convention.

The Kingdom of Belgium also wishes to emphasize the importance which it attaches to respect for the rights set forth in the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, especially in articles 10 and 11 dealing respectively with freedom of opinion and expression and freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

BULGARIA[17]

The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the provisions of article 17, paragraph 1, and article 18, paragraph 1, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the effect of which is to prevent sovereign States from becoming Parties to the Convention, are of a discriminatory nature. The Convention, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, should be open for accession by all States without any discrimination whatsoever.

CHINA[18]

Reservation:

The People's Republic of China has reservations on the provisions of article 22 of the Convention and will not be bound by it. *(The reservation was circulated by the Secretary-General on 13 January 1982.)*

Declaration:

The signing and ratification of the said Convention by the Taiwan authorities in the name of China are illegal and null and void.

CUBA

Upon signature:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba will make such reservations as it may deem appropriate if and when the Convention is ratified.

Upon ratification:

Reservation:

The Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba does not accept the provision in article 22 of the Convention to the effect that disputes between two or more States Parties shall be referred to the International Court of Justice, since it considers that such disputes should be settled exclusively by the procedures expressly provided for in the Convention or by negotiation through the diplomatic channel between the disputants.

Statement:

This Convention, intended to eliminate all forms of racial discrimination, should not, as it expressly does in articles 17 and 18, exclude States not Members of the United Nations, members of the specialized agencies or Parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice from making an effective contribution under the Convention, since these articles constitute in themselves a form of discrimination that is at variance with the principles set out in the Convention; the Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba accordingly ratifies the Convention, but with the qualification just indicated.

CZECH REPUBLIC[5]

DENMARK[6]

EGYPT[15,19]

"The United Arab Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and it states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for referring the dispute to the International Court of Justice."

EQUATORIAL GUINEA

Reservation:

The Republic of Equatorial Guinea does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision. The Republic of Equatorial Guinea considers that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties is necessary for referring the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

FIJI

The reservation and declarations formulated by the Government of the United Kingdom on behalf of Fiji are affirmed but have been redrafted in the following terms:

"To the extent, if any, that any law relating to elections in Fiji may not fulfil the obligations referred to in article 5 (c), that any law relating to land in Fiji which prohibits or restricts the alienation of land by the indigenous inhabitants may not fulfil the obligations referred to in article 5 (d) (v), or that the school system of Fiji may not fulfil the obligations referred to in articles 2, 3, or 5 (e) (v), the Government of Fiji reserves the right not to implement the aforementioned provisions of the Convention.

"The Government of Fiji wishes to state its understanding of certain articles in the Convention. It interprets article 4 as requiring a party to the Convention to adopt further legislative measures in the fields covered by sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only in so far as it may consider with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5 of the Convention (in particular the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association) that some legislative addition to or variation of existing law and practice in those fields is necessary for the attainment of the end specified in the earlier part of Article 4.

Further, the Government of Fiji interprets the requirement in article 6 concerning `reparation or satisfaction' as being fulfilled if one or other of these forms of redress is made available and interprets `satisfaction' as including any form of redress effective to bring the discriminatory conduct to an and. In addition it interprets article 20 and the other related provisions of Part III of the Convention as meaning that if a reservation is not accepted the State making the reservation does not become a Party to the Convention.

"The Government of Fiji maintains the view that Article 15 is discriminatory in that it establishes a procedure for the receipt of petitions relating to dependent territories whilst making no comparable provision for States without such territories."

FRANCE[20]

With regard to article 4, France wishes to make it clear that it interprets the reference made therein to the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and to the rights set forth in article 5 of the Convention as releasing the States Parties from the obligation to enact anti-discrimination legislation which is incompatible with the freedoms of opinion and expression and of peaceful assembly and association guaranteed by those texts.

With regard to article 6, France declares that the question of remedy through tribunals is, as far as France is concerned, governed by the rules of ordinary law.

With regard to article 15, France's accession to the Convention may not be interpreted as implying any change in its position regarding the resolution mentioned in that provision.

GUYANA

"The Government of the Republic of Guyana do not interpret the provisions of this Convention as imposing upon them any obligation going beyond the limits set by the Constitution of Guyana or imposing upon them any obligation requiring the introduction of judicial processes going beyond those provided under the same Constitution."

HUNGARY[21]

"The Hungarian People's Republic considers that the provisions of article 17, paragraph 1, and of article 18, paragraph 1, of the Convention, barring accession to the Convention by all States, are of a discriminating nature and contrary to international law. The Hungarian People's Republic maintains its general position that multilateral treaties of a universal character should, in conformity with the principles of sovereign equality of States, be open for accession by all States without any discrimination whatever."

INDIA[22]

"The Government of India declare that for reference of any dispute to the International Court of Justice for decision in terms of Article 22 of the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination, the consent of all parties to the dispute is necessary in each individual case."

INDONESIA

Reservation:

"The Government of the Republic of Indonesia does not consider itself bound by the provision of Article 22 and takes the position that disputes relating to the interpretation and application of the [Convention] which cannot be settled through the channel provided for in the said article, may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all the parties to the dispute."

IRAQ[15]

Upon signature:

"The Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq hereby declares that signature for and on behalf of the Republic of Iraq of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 21 December 1965, as well as approval by the Arab States of the said Convention and entry into it by their respective governments, shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or lead to entry by the Arab States into such dealings with Israel as may be regulated by the said Convention.

"Furthermore, the Government of the Republic of Iraq does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article twenty-two of the Convention afore-mentioned and affirms its reservation that it does not accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice provided for in the said article."

Upon ratification:

1. The acceptance and ratification of the Convention by Iraq shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or be conducive to entry by Iraq into such dealings with Israel as are regulated by the Convention;
2. Iraq does not accept the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, concerning the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. The Republic of Iraq does not consider itself to be bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention and deems it necessary that in all cases the approval of all parties to the dispute be secured before the case is referred to the International Court of Justice.

IRELAND

Reservation/Interpetative declaration:

"Article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination provides that the measures specifically described in sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) shall be undertaken with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in Article 5 of the Convention. Ireland threfore considers that through such measures, the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to peaceful assembly and association may not be jeopardised. These rights are laid down in Articles 19 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; they were reaffirmed by the General Assembly of the United Nations when it adopted Articles 19 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and are referred to in Article 5 (d)(viii) and (ix) of the present Convention."

ISRAEL

"The State of Israel does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the said Convention."

ITALY

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratifica- tion:

(a) The positive measures, provided for in article 4 of the Convention and specifically described in sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) of that article, designed to eradicate all incitement to, or acts of, discrimination, are to be interpreted, as that article provides, "with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5" of the Convention. Consequently, the obligations deriving from the aforementioned article 4 are not to jeopardize the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association which are laid down in articles 19 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, were reaffirmed by the General Assembly of the United Nations when it adopted articles 19 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and are referred to in articles 5 (d) (viii) and (ix) of the Convention. In fact, the Italian Government, in conformity with the obligations resulting from Articles 55 (c) and 56 of the Charter of the United Nations, remains faithful to the principle laid down in article 29 (2) of the Universal Declaration, which provides that "in the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society."

(b) Effective remedies against acts of racial discrimination which violate his individual rights and fundamental freedoms will be assured to everyone, in conformity with article 6 of the Convention, by the ordinary courts within the framework of their respective jurisdiction. Claims for reparation for any damage suffered as a result of acts of racial discrimination must be brought against the persons responsible for the malicious or criminal acts which caused such damage.

JAMAICA

"The Constitution of Jamaica entrenches and guarantees to every person in Jamaica the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual irrespective of his race or place of origin. The Constitution prescribes judicial processes to be observed in the event of the violation of any of these rights whether by the State or by a private individual. Ratification of the Convention by Jamaica does not imply the acceptance of obligations going beyond the constitutional limits nor the acceptance of any obligation to introduce judicial processes beyond those prescribed under the Constitution."

JAPAN

Reservation:

"In applying the provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of article 4 of the [said Convention] Japan fulfills the obligations under those provisions to the extent that fulfillment of the obligations is compatible with the guarantee of the rights to freedom of assembly, association and expression and other rights under the Constitution of Japan, noting the phrase `with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5 of this Convention' referred to in article 4."

KUWAIT[15]

"In acceding to the said Convention, the Government of the State of Kuwait takes the view that its accession does not in any way imply recognition of Israel, nor does it oblige it to apply the provisions of the Convention in respect of the said country.

"The Government of the State of Kuwait does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any party to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and it states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for referring the dispute to the International Court of Justice."

LEBANON

The Republic of Lebanon does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any party to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and it states that, in each individual case, the consent of all States parties to such a dispute is necessary for referring the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA[15]

"(a) The Kingdom of Libya does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and it states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for referring the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

"(b) It is understood that the accession to this Convention does not mean in any way a recognition of Israel by the Government of the Kingdom of Libya. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the Kingdom of Libya and Israel."

MADAGASCAR

The Government of the Malagasy Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for referral of the dispute to the International Court.

MALTA

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratifica- tion :

"The Government of Malta wishes to state its understanding of certain articles in the Convention.

"It interprets article 4 as requiring a party to the Convention to adopt further measures in the fields covered by sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article should it consider, with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights set forth in article 5 of the Convention, that the need arises to enact ' *ad hoc* ' legislation, in addition to or variation of existing law and practice to bring to an end any act of racial discrimination.

"Further, the Government of Malta interprets the requirements in article 6 concerning `reparation or satisfaction' as being fulfilled if one or other of these forms of redress is made available and interprets `satisfaction' as including any form of redress effective to bring the discriminatory conduct to an end."

MONACO

Reservation regarding article 2, paragraph 1:

Monaco reserves the right to apply its own legal provisions concerning the admission of foreigners to the labour market of the Principality.

Reservation regarding article 4:

Monaco interprets the reference in that article to the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and to the rights enumerated in article 5 of the Convention as releasing States Parties from the obligation to promulgate repressive laws which are incompatible with freedom of opinion and expression and freedom of peaceful assembly and association, which are guaranteed by those instruments.

MONGOLIA[23]

The Mongolian People's Republic states that the provision in article 17, paragraph 1, of the Convention whereby a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become Parties to the Convention is of a discriminatory nature, and it holds that, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination should be open to participation by all interested States without discrimination or restriction of any kind.

MOROCCO

The Kingdom of Morocco does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision. The Kingdom of Morocco states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for referring the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

MOZAMBIQUE

Reservation:

"The People's Republic of Mozambique does not consider to be bound by the provision of article 22 and wishes to restate that for the submission of any dispute to the International Court of Justice for decision in terms of the said article, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary in each individual case."

NEPAL

"The Constitution of Nepal contains provisions for the protection of individual rights, including the right to freedom of speech and expression, the right to form unions and associations not motivated by party politics and the right to freedom of professing his/her own religion; and nothing in the Convention shall be deemed to require or to authorize legislation or other action by Nepal incompatible with the provisions of the Constitution of Nepal.

"His Majesty's Government interprets article 4 of the said Convention as requiring a Party to the Convention to adopt further legislative measures in the fields covered by sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only insofar as His Majesty's Government may consider, with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that some legislative addition to, or variation of, existing law and practice in those fields is necessary for the attainment of the end specified in the earlier part of article 4. His Majesty's Government interprets the requirement in article 6 concerning `reparation or satisfaction' as being fulfilled if one or other of these forms of redress is made available; and further interprets `satisfaction' as including any form of redress effective to bring the discriminatory conduct to an end.

"His Majesty's Government does not consider itself bound by the provision of article 22 of the Convention under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision."

PAPUA NEW GUINEA[18]

Reservation:

"The Government of Papua New Guinea interprets article 4 of the Convention as requiring a party to the Convention to adopt further legislative measures in the areas covered by sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only in so far as it may consider with due regard to the principles contained in the Universal Declaration set out in Article 5 of the Convention that some legislative addition to, or variation of existing law and practice, is necessary to give effect to the provisions of article 4. In addition, the Constitution of Papua New Guinea guarantees certain fundamental rights and freedoms to all persons irrespective of their race or place of origin. The Constitution also provides for judicial protection of these rights and freedoms. Acceptance of this Convention does not therefore indicate the acceptance of obligations by the Government of Papua New Guinea which go beyond those provided by the Constitution, nor does it indicate the acceptance of any obligation to introduce judicial process beyond that provided by the Constitution". *(The reservation was circulated by the Secretary-General on 22 February 1982.)*

POLAND[24]

The Polish People's Republic considers that the provisions of article 17, paragraph 1, and article18, paragraph 1, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which make it impossible for many States to become parties to the said Convention, are of a discriminatory nature and are incompatible with the object and purpose of that Convention.

The Polish People's Republic considers that, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the said Convention should be open for participation by all States without any discrimination or restrictions whatsoever.

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

5 March 1997

"The Government of the Republic of Korea recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of the Republic of Korea claiming to be victims of a violation by the Republic of Korea of any of the rights set forth in the said Convention."

ROMANIA[25]

...

The Council of State of the Socialist Republic of Romania declares that the provisions of articles 17 and 18 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination are not in accordance with the principle that multilateral treaties, the aims and objectives of which concern the world community as a whole, should be open to participation by all States.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[16]

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics states that the provision in article 17, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination whereby a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become Parties to the Convention is of a discriminatory nature, and hold that, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the Convention should be open to participation by all interested States without discrimination or restriction of any kind.

RWANDA[26]

SAUDI ARABIA

Reservations:

[The Government of Saudi Arabia declares that it will] implement the provisions [of the above Convention], providing these do not conflict with the precepts of the Islamic *Shariah* .

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia shall not be bound by the provisions of article (22) of this Convention, since it considers that any dispute should be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the approval of the States Parties to the dispute.

SLOVAKIA[5]

SPAIN[27]

SWITZERLAND

Reservation concerning article 4:

Switzerland reserves the right to take the legislative measures necessary for the implementation of article 4, taking due account of freedom of opinion and freedom of association, provided for *inter alia* in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Reservation concerning article 2, paragraph 1 (a):

Switzerland reserves the right to apply its legal provisions concerning the admission of foreigners to the Swiss market.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC[15]

1. The accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to this Convention shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or entry into a relationship with it regarding any matter regulated by the said Convention.
2. The Syrian Arab Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the Parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision. The Syrian Arab Republic states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for referring the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

THAILAND

Interpretative declaration :

"General Interpretative Declaration

The Kingdom of Thailand does not interpret and apply the provisions of this Convention as imposing upon the Kingdom of Thailand any obligation beyond the confines of the Constitution and the laws of the Kingdom of Thailand. In addition, such interpretation and application shall be limited to or consistent with the obligations under other international human rights instruments to which the Kingdom of Thailand is party.

Reservations

1. The Kingdom of Thailand interprets Article 4 of the Convention as requiring a party to the Convention to adopt measures in the fields covered by subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only where it is considered that the need arises to enact such legislation.

2. The Kingdom of Thailand does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 22 of the Convention."

TONGA[28]

Reservation:

"To the extent, [...], that any law relating to land in Tonga which prohibits or restricts the alienation of land by the indigenous inhabitants may not fulfil the obligations referred to in article 5 (d) (v), [...], the Kingdom of Tonga reserves the right not to apply the Convention to Tonga.

Declaration:

"Secondly, the Kingdom of Tonga wishes to state its understanding of certain articles in the Convention. It interprets article 4 as requiring a party to the Convention to adopt further legislative measures in the fields covered by sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only in so far as it may consider with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5 of the Convention (in particular the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association) that some legislative addition to or variation of existing law and practice in those fields is necessary for the attainment of the end specified in the earlier part of article 4. Further, the Kingdom of Tonga interprets the requirement in article 6 concerning `reparation or satisfaction' as being fulfilled if one or other of these forms of redress is made available and interprets `satisfaction' as including any form of redress effective to bring the discriminatory conduct to an end. In addition it interprets article 20 and the other related provisions of Part III of the Convention as meaning that if a reservation is not accepted the State making the reservation does not become a Party to the Convention.

"Lastly, the Kingdom of Tonga maintains its position in regard to article 15. In its view this article is discriminatory in that it establishes a procedure for the receipt of petitions relating to dependent territories while making no comparable provision for States without such territories. Moreover, the article purports to establish arocedure applicable to the dependent territories of States whether or not those States have become parties to the Convention. His Majesty's Government have decided that the Kingdom of Tonga should accede to the Convention, these objections notwithstanding because of the importance they attach to the Convention as a whole."

TURKEY

Declarations and reservation:

"The Republic of Turkey declares that it will implement the provisions of this Convention only to the States Parties with which it has diplomatic relations.

The Republic of Turkey declares that this Convention is ratified exclusively with regard to the national territory where the Constitution and the legal and administrative order of the Republic of Turkey are applied.

The Republic of Turkey does not consider itself bound by Article 22 of this Convention. The explicit consent of the Republic of Turkey is necessary in each individual case before any dispute to which the Republic of Turkey is party concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention may be referred to the International Court of Justice."

UKRAINE[16]

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic states that the provision in article 17, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination whereby a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become Parties to the Convention is of a discriminatory nature, and hold that, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the Convention should be open to participation by all interested States without discrimination or restriction of any kind.

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES[15]

"The accession of the United Arab Emirates to this Convention shall in no way amount to recognition of nor the establishment of any treaty relations with Israel."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Upon signature:

Subject to the following reservation and interpretative statements:

"First, in the present circumstances deriving from the usurpation of power in Rhodesia by the illegal régime, the United Kingdom must sign subject to a reservation of the right not to apply the Convention to Rhodesia unless and until the United Kingdom informs the Secretary-General of the United Nations that it is in a position to ensure that the obligations imposed by the Convention in respect of that territory can be fully implemented.

"Secondly, the United Kingdom wishes to state its under- standing of certain articles in the Convention. It interprets article 4 as requiring a party to the Convention to adopt further legislative measures in the fields covered by sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only in so far as it may consider with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5 of the Convention (in particular the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association) that some legislative addition to or variation of existing law and practice in those fields is necessary for the attainment of the end specified in the earlier part of article 4. Further, the United Kingdom interprets the requirement in article 6 concerning `reparation or satisfaction' as being fulfilled if one or other of these forms of redress is made available and interprets `satisfaction' as including any form of redress effective to bring the discriminatory conduct to an end. In addition it interprets article 20 and the other related provisions of Part III of the Convention as meaning that if a reservation is not accepted the State making the reservation does not become a Party to the Convention.

"Lastly, the United Kingdom maintains its position in regard to article 15. In its view this article is discriminatory in that it establishes arocedure for the receipt of petitions relating to dependent territories while making no comparable provision for States without such territories. Moreover, the article purports to establish a procedure applicable to the dependent territories of States whether or not those States have become parties to the Convention. Her Majesty's Government have decided that the United Kingdom should sign the Convention, these objections notwithstanding, because of the importance they attach to the Convention as a whole."

Upon ratification:

"First, the reservation and interpretative statements made by the United Kingdom at the time of signature of the Convention are maintained.

"Secondly, the United Kingdom does not regard the Commonwealth Immigrants Acts, 1962 and 1968, or their application, as involving any racial discrimination within the meaning of paragraph 1 of article 1, or any other provision of the Convention, and fully reserves its right to continue to apply those Acts.

"Lastly, to the extent if any, that any law relating to election in Fiji may not fulfil the obligations referred to in article 5 (c), that any law relating to land in Fiji which prohibits or restricts the alienation of land by the indigenous inhabitants may not fulfil the obligations referred to in article 5 (d) (v), or that the school system of Fiji may not fulfil the obligations referred to in articles 2, 3 or 5 (e) (v), the United Kingdom reserves the right not to apply the Convention to Fiji."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Upon signature:

"The Constitution of the United States contains provisions for the protection of individual rights, such as the right of free speech, and nothing in the Convention shall be deemed to require or to authorize legislation or other action by the United States of America incompatible with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States of America."

Upon ratification:

"I. The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following reservations:

(1) That the Constitution and laws of the United States contain extensive protections of individual freedom of speech, expression and association. Accordingly, the United States does not accept any obligation under this Convention, in particular under articles 4 and 7, to restrict those rights, through the adoption of legislation or any other measures, to the extent that they are protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

(2) That the Constitution and laws of the United States establish extensive protections against discrimination, reaching significant areas of non-governmental activity. Individual privacy and freedom from governmental interference in private conduct, however, are also recognized as among the fundamental values which shape our free and democratic society. The United States understands that the identification of the rights protected under the Convention by reference in article 1 to fields of `public life' reflects a similar distinction between spheres of public conduct that are customarily the subject of governmental regulation, and spheres of private conduct that are not. To the extent, however, that the Convention calls for a broader regulation of private conduct, the United States does not accept any obligation under this Convention to enact legislation or take other measures under paragraph (1) of article 2, subparagraphs (1) (c) and (d) of article 2, article 3 and article 5 with respect to private conduct except as mandated by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

(3) That with reference to article 22 of the Convention, before any dispute to which the United States is a party may be submitted to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under this article, the specific consent of the United States is required in each case.

II. The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following understanding, which shall apply to the obligations of the United States under this Convention:

That the United States understands that this Convention shall be implemented by the Federal Government to the extent that it exercises jurisdiction over the matters covered therein, and otherwise by the state and local governments. To the extent that state and local governments exercise jurisdiction over such matters, the Federal Government shall, as necessary, take appropriate measures to ensure the fulfilment of this Convention.

III. The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following declaration:

That the United States declares that the provisions of the Convention are not self-executing."

VIET NAM[18]

Declaration:

(1) The Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam declares that the provisions of article 17 (1) and of article 18 (1) of the Convention whereby a number of States are deprived of the opportunity of becoming Parties to the said Convention are of a discriminatory nature and it considers that, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the Convention should be open to participation by all States without discrimination or restriction of any kind.

Reservation:

(2) The Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention and holds that, for any dispute with regard to the interpretation or application of the Convention to be brought before the International Court of Justice, the consent of all parties to the dispute is necessary. *(The reservation was circulated by the Secretary-General on 10 August 1982.)*

YEMEN[14,15]

"The accession of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen to this Convention shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or entry into a relationship with it regarding any matter regulated by the said Convention.

"The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for referral of the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

"The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen states that the provisions of Article 17, paragraph 1, and Article 18, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination whereby a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become Parties to the Convention is of a discriminatory nature, and holds that, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the Convention should be opened to participation by all interested States without discrimination or restriction of any kind."

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRALIA

8 August 1989

"In accordance with article 20 (2), Australia objects to [the reservations made by Yemen] which it considers impermissible as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention."

AUSTRIA

19 February 1998

With regard to the general reservation made by Saudi Arabia upon accession:

"Austria is of the view that a reservation by which a State limits its responsibilities under the Convention in a general and unspecified manner creates doubts as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia with its obligations under the Convention, essential for the fulfilment of its objection and purpose. According to paragraph 2 of article 20 a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of this Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become Parties are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

Austria is further of the view that a general reservation of the kind made by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, which does not clearly specify the provisions of the Convention to which it applies and the extent of the derogation therefrom, contributes to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

According to international law a reservation is inadmissible to the extent as its application negatively affects the compliance by a State with its obligations under the Convention essential for the fulfilment of its object and purpose.

Therefore, Austria cannot consider the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia as admissible unless the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, by providing additional information or through subsequent practice, ensures that the reservation is compatible with the provisions essential for the implementation of the object and purpose of the Convention.

This view by Austria would not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Convention between the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and Austria."

BELARUS

29 December 1983

The ratification of the above-mentioned International Convention by the so-called "Government of Democratic Kampuchea"-the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique of hangmen overthrown by the Kampuchean people - is completely unlawful and has no legal force. There is only one State of Kampuchea in the world-The People's Republic of Kampuchea, recognized by a large number of countries. All power in this State is entirely in the hands of its only lawful Government, the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, which has the exclusive right to act in the name of Kampuchea in the international arena, including the right to ratify international agreements prepared within the United Nations.

The farce involving the ratification of the above-mentioned International Convention by a clique representing no one mocks the norms of law and morality and blasphemes the memory of millions of Kampuchean victims of the genocide committed by the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime.

BELGIUM

8 August l989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

These reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and consequently are not permitted pursuant to article 20, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

CANADA

10 August 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

"The effect of these reservations would be to allow racial discrimination in respect of certain of the rights enumerated in Article 5. Since the objective of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, as stated in its Preamble, is to eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms and manifestations, the Government of Canada believes that the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic are incompatible with the object and purpose of the International Convention. Moreover, the Government of Canada believes that the principle of non-discrimination is generally accepted and recognized in international law and therefore is binding on all states."

CYPRUS

5 August 2003

With regard to the reservation made by Turkey upon ratification:

".....the Government of the Republic of Cyprus has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Republic of Turkey to the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (New York, 7 March 1966) on 16 September 2002 in respect of the implementation of the provisions of the Convention only to the States Parties with which it has diplomatic relations.

In the view of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus, this declaration amounts to a reservation. This reservation creates uncertainty as to the States Parties in respect of which Turkey is undertaking the obligations in the Convention. The Government of the Republic of Cyprus therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Turkey.

This reservation or the objection to it shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Cyprus and the Republic of Turkey."

CZECH REPUBLIC[5]

DENMARK

10 July 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

"Article 5 contains undertakings, in compliance with the fundamental obligations laid down in article 2 of the Convention, to prohibit and to eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms and to guarantee the right of everyone, without distinction as to race, colour, or national or ethnic origin, to equality before the law, notably in the enjoyment of the rights enumerated in the article.

The reservations made by the Government of Yemen are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and the reservations are consequently impermissible according to article 20, paragraph 2 of the Convention. In accordance with article 20, paragraph 1 of the Convention the Government of Denmark therefore formally objects to these reservations. This objection does not have the effect of preventing the Convention from entering into force between Denmark and Yemen, and the reservations cannot alter or modify in any respect, the obligations arising from the Convention."

ETHIOPIA

25 January 1984

"The Provisional Military Government of Socialist Ethiopia should like to reiterate that the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea is the sole legitimate representative of the People of Kampuchea and as such it alone has the authority to act on behalf of Kampuchea.

The Provisional Military Government of Socialist Ethiopia, therefore, considers the ratification of the so-called `Government of Democratic Kampuchea' to be null and void."

FINLAND

7 July 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

"The Government of Finland formally, and in accordance with article 20 (2) of the Convention, objects to the reservations made by Yemen to the above provisions.

In the first place, the reservations concern matters which are of fundamental importance in the Convention. The first paragraph of article 5 clearly brings this out. According to it, the Parties have undertaken to guarantee the rights listed in that article "In compliance with fundamental obligations laid down in article 2 of the Convention". Clearly, provisions prohibiting racial discrimination in the granting of such fundamental political rights and civil liberties as the right to participate in public life, to marry and choose a spouse, to inherit and to enjoy freedom of thought, conscience and religion are central in a convention against racial discrimination. Therefore, the reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, as specified in paragraph 20 (2) thereof and in article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Moreover, it is the view of the Government of Finland that it would be unthinkable that merely by making a reservation to the said provisions, a State could achieve the liberty to start discriminatory practices on the grounds of race, colour, or national or ethnic origin in regard to such fundamental political rights and civil liberties as the right to participate in the conduct of public affairs, the right of marriage and choice of spouse, the right of inheritance and the freedom of thought, conscience and religion. Any racial discrimination in respect of those fundamental rights and liberties is clearly against the general principles of human rights law as reflected in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and the practice of States and international organizations. By making a reservation atate cannot contract out from universally binding human rights standards.

For the above reasons, the Government of Finland notes that the reservations made by Yemen are devoid of legal effect. However, the Government of Finland does not consider that this fact is an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention in respect of Yemen."

6 February 1998

With regard to the general reservation made by Saudi Arabia upon accession:

"The Government of Finland is of the view that this general reservation raises doubts as to the commitment of Saudi Arabia to the object and purpose of the Convention and would recall that according to paragraph 2 of article 20 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. The Government of Finland would also like to recall that according to the said paragraph a reservation shall be considered incompatible or inhibitive if at least two thirds of the States Parties to the Convention object to it. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Finland is further of the view that general reservations of the kind made by Saudi Arabia, which do not clearly specify the provisions of the Convention to which they apply and the extent of the derogation therefrom, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the aforesaid general reservation made by the Government of Saudi Arabia to the [Convention].

FRANCE

15 May 1984

The Government of the French Republic, which does not recognize the coalition government of Democratic Cambodia, declares that the instrument of ratification by the coalition government of Democratic Cambodia of the [International] Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, opened for signature at New York on 7 March 1966, is without effect.

20 September 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

France considers that the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination are not valid as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Such objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between France and the Yemen Arab Republic.

25 April 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Thailand upon accession:

The Government of the Republic of France has examined the interpretative declaration made by the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination of 7 March 1966. The Government of the Republic of France considers that, by making the interpretation and implementation of the provisions of the Convention subject to respect for the Constitution and legislation of the Kingdom of Thailand, the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand is making a reservation of such a general and indeterminate scope that it is not possible to ascertain which changes to obligations under the Convention it is intended to introduce. Consequently, the Government of France considers that this reservation as formulated could make the provisions of the Convention completely ineffective. For these reasons, the Government objects to this interpretative declaration, which it considers to be a reservation likely toe incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

GERMANY[3]

8 August 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

"These reservations relate to the basic obligations of States Parties to the Convention to prohibit and eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms and to guarantee the right of everyone to equality before the law and include the enjoyment of such fundamental political and civil rights as the right to take part in the conduct of public life, the right to marriage and choice of spouse, the right to inherit and the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. As a result, the reservations made by Yemen are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention within the meaning of article 20, paragraph 2 thereof."

3 February 1998

With regard to the general reservation made by Saudi Arabia upon accession:

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the view that this reservation may raise doubts as to the commitment of Saudi Arabia to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany would like to recall that, according to paragraph 2 of article 20 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the said reservation.

The objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Saudi Arabia and the Federal Republic of Germany.

29 April 2003

With regard to the interpretative declaration made by Thailand upon accession:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has examined the General Interpretative Declaration to the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination made by the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand at the time of its accession to the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Repblic of Germany considers that the General Interpretative Declaration made by Thailand is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on an unilateral basis.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany notes that a reservation to all provisions of a Convention which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define for the other State Parties to the Convention the extend to which the reserving state has accepted the obligations out of the provisions of the Convention.

The reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand in respect to the applications of the provisions of the Convention therefore raises doubts as to the commitment of Thailand to fulfill its obligations out of all provisions of the Convention.

Hence the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers this reservation to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and objects to the General Interpretative Declaration made by the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Kingdom of Thailand."

ITALY

7 August 1989

"The Government of the Republic of Italy raises an objection to the reservations entered by the Government of the Arab Republic of Yemen to article 5 [(c) and (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii)] of the above-mentioned Convention."

MEXICO

11 August 1989

With regard to reservation made by Yemen concerning article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

The Government of the United Mexican States has concluded that, in view of article 20 of the Convention, the reservation must be deemed invalid, as it is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Said reservation, if implemented would result in discrimination to the detriment of a certain sector of the population and, at the same time, would violate the rights established in articles 2, 16 and 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

The objection of the United Mexican States to the reservation in question should not be interpreted as an impediment to the entry into force of the Convention of 1966 between the United States of Mexico and the Government of Yemen.

MONGOLIA

7 June 1984

"The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that only the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea as the sole authentic and lawful representative of the Kampuchean people has the right to assume international obligations on behalf of the Kampuchean people. Therefore the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that the ratification of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination by the so-called Democratic Kampuchea, a regime that ceased to exist as a result of the people's revolution in Kampuchea, is null and void."

NETHERLANDS

25 July 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the above-mentioned reservations, as they are incompatible with object and purpose of the Convention.

These objections are not an obstacle for the entry into force of this Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Yemen."

3 February 1998

With regard to the general reservation made by Saudi Arabia upon accession:

[Same objection, identical in essence, as the one made for Yemen.]

NEW ZEALAND

4 August 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

"The New Zealand Government is of the view that those provisions contain undertakings which are themselves fundamental to the Convention. Accordingly it considers that the reservations purportedly made by Yemen relating to political and civil rights are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Treaty within the terms of the article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

The Government of New Zealand advises therefore under article 20 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination that it does not accept the reservations made by Yemen."

NORWAY

28 July 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

"The Government of Norway hereby enters its formal objection to the reservations made by Yemen."

6 February 1998

With regard to the general reservation made by Saudi Arabia upon accession:

"The Government of Norway considers that the reservation made by the Government of Saudi Arabia, due to its unlimited scope and undefined character, is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, and thus impermissible under article 20, paragraph 2, of the Convention. Under well-established treaty law, a State party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform treaty obligations. For these reasons, the Government of Norway objects to the reservation made by the Government of Saudi Arabia.

The Government of Norway does not consider this objection to preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Norway and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia."

ROMANIA

3 December 2003

With regard to the general interpretative declaration made by Thailand upon accession:

"The Government of Romania has examined the general interpretative declaration made by the Government of Thailand at the time of its accession to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination.

The Government of Romania considers that the general interpretative declaration is, in fact, a reservation formulated in general terms, that not allows to clearly identify the obligations assumed by Thailand with regard to this legal instrument and, consequently, to state the consistency of this reservation with the purpose and object of the above-mentioned Convention, in accordance with the provisions of article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (1969).

The Government of Romania therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by Thailand to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination.

This objection, however, shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Government of Romania and Thailand."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

28 December 1983

The ratification of the above-mentioned International Convention by the so-called "Government of Democratic Kampuchea"-the Pol Pot clique of hangmen overthrown by the Kampuchean people-is completely unlawful and has no legal force. Only the representatives authorized by the State Council of the People's Republic of Kampuchea can act in the name of Kampuchea. There is only one State of Kampuchea in the world -the People's Republic of Kampuchea, which has been recognized by a large number of countries. All power in this State is entirely in the hands of its only lawful Government, the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, which has the exclusive right to act in the name of Kampuchea in the international arena, including the right to ratify international agreements prepared within the United Nations.

Nor should one fail to observe that the farce involving the ratification of the above-mentioned International Convention by a clique representing no one mocks the norms of law and morality and is a direct insult to the memory of millions of Kampuchean victims of the genocide committed against the Kampuchean people by the Pol Pot Sary régime. The entire international community is familiar with the bloody crimes of that puppet clique.

SLOVAKIA[5]

SPAIN

18 September 1998

With regard to the general reservation made by Saudi Arabia upon accession:

The Government of Spain considers that, given its unlimited scope and undefined nature, the reservation made by the Government of Saudi Arabia is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention and therefore inadmissible under article 10, paragraph 2, of the Convention. Under the generally accepted law of treaties, a State party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as a justification for failure to perform its treaty obligations. The Government of Spain therefore formulates an objection to the reservation made by the Government of Saudi Arabia. The Government of Spain does not consider that this objection constitutes an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Spain and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

SWEDEN

5 July 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

"Article 5 contains undertakings, in compliance with the fundamental obligations laid down in article 2 of the Convention, to prohibit and to eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms and to guarantee the right of everyone, without distinction as to race, colour, or national or ethnic origin, to equality before the law, notably in the enjoyment of the rights enumerated in the article.

The Government of Sweden has come to the conclusion that the reservations made by Yemen are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and therefore are impermissible according to article 20, paragraph 2 of the Convention. For this reason the Government of Sweden objects to these reservations. This objection does not have the effect of preventing the Convention from entering into force between Sweden and Yemen, and the reservations cannot alter or modify, in any respect, the obligations arising from the Convention."

27 January 1998

With regard to the general reservation made by Saudi Arabia upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden notes that the said reservation is a reservation of a general kind in respect of the provisions of the Convention which may be in conflict with the precepts of the Islamic *Shariah* .

The Government of Sweden is of the view that this general reservation raises doubts as to the commitment [of] Saudi Arabia to the object and purpose of the Convention and would recall that, according to article 20, paragraph 2, of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of this Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that states are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessar to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden is further of the view that general reservations of the kind made by the Government of Saudi Arabia, which do not clearly specify the provisions of the Convention to which they apply and the extent of the derogation therefrom, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid general reservation made by the Government of Saudi Arabia to the [said Convention].

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Saudi Arabia and Sweden. The Convention will thus become operative between the two states without Saudi Arabia benefiting from this reservation."

14 January 2003

With regard to declarations made by Turkey upon ratification:

The Government of Sweden has examined the declarations made by Turkey upon ratifying the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

Paragraph 1 of the declaration states that Turkey will implement the provisions of the Convention only to the States Parties with which it has diplomatic relations. This statement in fact amounts, in the view of the Government of Sweden, to a reservation. The reservation makes it unclear to what extent the Turkey considers itself bound by the obligations of the Convention. In absence of further clarification, therefore, the reservation raises doubts as to the commitment of Turkey to the object and purpose of the Convention.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to article 20 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Sweden objects to the said reservation made by the Government of Turkey to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Turkey and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entiretv between the two States, without Turkey benefiting from its reservation.

27 January 2004

With regard to the interpretative declaration made by Thailand upon ratification:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the general interpretative declaration made by the Kingdom of Thailand upon acceding to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

The Government of Sweden recalls that the designation assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. The Government of Sweden considers that the interpretative declaration made by the Kingdom of Thailand in substance constitutes a reservation.

The Government of Sweden notes that the application of the Convention is being made subject to a general reservation referring to the confines of national legislation, without specifying its contents. Such a reservation makes it unclear to what extent the reserving state considers itself bound by the obligations of the Convention. The reservation made by the Kingdom of Thailand therefore raises doubts as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Thailand to the object and purpose of the Convention. In addition, according to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a party to a treaty may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to abide by the treaty.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to customary law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Kingdom of Thailand to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Thailand and Sweden. The Convention enters into force between the two States, without the Kingdom of Thailand benefitting from this reservation."

UKRAINE

17 January 1984

The ratification of the above-mentioned international Convention by the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique, which is guilty of the annihilation of millions of Kampucheans and which was overthrown in 1979 by the Kampuchean people, is thoroughly illegal and has no juridical force. There is only one Kampuchean State in the World, namely, the People's Republic of Kampuchea. All authority in this State is vested wholly in its sole legitimate government, the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea. This Government alone has the exclusive right to speak on behalf of Kampuchea at the international level, while the supreme organ of State power, the State Council of the People's Republic of Kampuchea has the exclusive right to ratify international agreements drawn up within the framework of the United Nations.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

4 August 1989

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland do not accept the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic to article 5 (c) and (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii) of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination."

26 June 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Turkey upon ratification:

"The Government of the United Kingdom have examined the declaration made by the Government of the Republic of Turkey to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (New York, 7 March 1966) on 16 September 2002 in respect of implementation of the provisions of the Convention only to the States Parties with which it has diplomatic relations.

In the view of the Government of the United Kingdom, this declaration amounts to a reservation. This reservation creates uncertainty as to the States Parties in respect of which Turkey is undertaking the obligations in the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Turkey.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Republic of Turkey."

With regard to the interpretative declaration made by Thailand upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom have examined the interpretative declaration made by the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (New York, 7 March 1966) on 28 January 2003 in respect of the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand having no obligation to interpret and apply the provisions of the Convention beyond the confines of the Constitution and the laws of the Kingdom of Thailand and, in addition, that the interpretation and application shall be limited to or consistent with the obligations under other international human rights instruments to which the Kingdom of Thailand is party.

In the view of the Government of the United Kingdom, this declaration amounts to a reservation. This reservation amounts to a general reference to national law without specifying its contents and does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the declaring State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Kingdom of Thailand."

VIET NAM

29 February 1984

"The Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam considers that only the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, which is the sole genuine and legitimate representative of the Kampuchean People, is empowered to act in their behalf to sign, ratify or accede to international conventions.

The Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam rejects as null and void the ratification of the above-mentioned international Convention by the so-called "Democratic Kampuchea"- a genocidal regime overthrown by the Kampuchean people since January 7, 1979.

Furthermore, the ratification of the Convention by a genocidal regime, which massacred more than 3 million Kampuchean people in gross violation of fundamental standards of morality and international laws on human rights, simply plays down the significance of the Convention and jeopardises the prestige of the United Nations."

Declarations recognizing the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination[29] in accordance with article 14 of the Convention

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ALGERIA

12 September 1989

The Algerian Government declares, pursuant to article 14 of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Commit tee to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by it of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

ANDORRA

22 September 2006

Pursuant to paragraph 1 of article 14 of the Convention, the Principality of Andorra declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals claiming to be victims of a violation by the Principality of Andorra of any of the rights set forth in the Convention. However, this procedure applies only insofar as the Committee has established that the same matter is not being examined, or has not been examined by another international body of investigation or settlement.

ARGENTINA

5 February 2007

Pursuant to the provisions of article 14, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Government of the Republic of Argentina designates the National Institute to Combat Discrimination, Xenophobia and Racism (INADI) as competent within the national legal system to receive and consider petitions from individuals and groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of the Republic of Argentina, who claims to be victims of a violation by the national government of the rights set forth in the Convention.

AUSTRALIA

28 January 1993

"The Government of Australia hereby declares that it recognises, for and on behalf of Australia, the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by Australia of any of the rights set forth in the aforesaid Convention."

AUSTRIA

20 February 2002

"The Republic of Austria recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of Austria claiming to be victims of a violation by Austria of any of the rights set forth in the Convention, with the reservation that the Committee shall not consider any communication from an individual or a group of individuals unless the Committee has ascertained that the facts of the case are not being examined or have not been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement. Austria reserves the right to indicate a national body as set forth in Article 14 paragraph 2."

AZERBAIJAN

27 September 2001

"In accordance with article 14, paragraph 1, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Racial Discrimination, the Government of the Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation of any of the rights set forth in the above-mentioned Convention."

BELGIUM

10 October 2000

Belgium recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, established by the aforementioned Convention, to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by Belgium of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

Pursuant to article 14, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Centre pour l'Egalité des Chances et la Lutte contre le Racisme (Centre for Equal Opportunity and the Struggle against Racism), established by the Act of 15 February 1993, has been designated as competent to receive and consider petitions from individuals and groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of Belgium who claim to be victims of a violation of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

Pursuant to article 14, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Centre pour l'Egalité des Chances et la Lutte contre le Racisme (Centre for Equal Opportunity and the Struggle against Racism), established by the Act of 15 February 1993, has been designated as competent to receive and consider petitions from individuals and groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of Belgium who claim to be victims of a violation of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

BOLIVIA

14 February 2006

"The Government of Bolivia recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination established under article 8 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, in compliance with article 14 of the Convention."

BRAZIL

17 June 2002

.....the Federative Republic of Brazil recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider complaints of human rights violations, as provided for under article XIV of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which was opened for signature in New York on 7th of March 1966.

BULGARIA

12 May 1993

"The Republic of Bulgaria declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by the Republic of Bulgaria of any of the rights set forth in this Convention."

CHILE

18 May 1994

In accordance with article 14 (1) of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Government of Chile declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by the Government of Chile of any of the rights set forth in this Convention.

COSTA RICA

8 January 1974

Costa Rica recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination established under article 8 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, in accordance with article 14 of the Convention, to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by the State of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

CYPRUS

30 December 1993

"The Republic of Cyprus recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination established under article 14 (1) of [the Convention] to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by the Republic of Cyprus of any of the rights set forth in this Convention.

CZECH REPUBLIC

11 October 2000

The Czech Republic declares that according to Article 14, paragraph 1 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination it recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation of any of the rights set forth in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

DENMARK

11 October 1985

Denmark recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within Danish jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by Denmark of any of the rights set forth in the Convention, with the reservation that the Committee shall not consider any communications unless it has ascertained that the same matter has not been, and is not being, examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

ECUADOR

18 March 1977

The State of Ecuador, by virtue of Article 14 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation of the rights set forth in the above-mentioned Convention.

FINLAND

16 November 1994

"Finland recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of Finland claiming to be victims of a violation by Finland of any of the rights set forth in the said Convention, with the reservation that the Committee shall not consider any communication from an individual or a group of individuals unless the Committee has ascertained that the same matter is not being examined or has not been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement."

FRANCE

16 August 1982

[The Government of the French Republic declares], in accordance with article 14 of the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination opened for signature on 7 March 1966, [that it] recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within French jurisdiction that either by reason of acts or omissions, events or deeds occurring after 15 August 1982, or by reason of a decision concerning the acts or omissions, events or deeds after the said date, would complain of being victims of a violation, by the French Republic, of one of the rights mentioned in the Convention.

GEORGIA

30 June 2005

"In accordance with Article 14, Paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination done at New York on March 7, 1966 Georgia recognizes the competence of the Committee for the elimination of racial discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation, by Georgia, of any of the rights set forth in the abovementioned Convention."

GERMANY

30 August 2001

The Federal Republic of Germany hereby declares that pursuant to Article 14 paragraph 1 of the Convention it recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within her jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by the Federal Republic of Germany of any of the rights set forth in this Convention. However, this shall only apply insofar as the Committee has determined that the same matter is not being or has not been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

HUNGARY

13 September 1989

"The Hungarian People's Republic hereby recognizes the competence of the Committee established by the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination provided for in paragraph 1 of article 14 of the Convention."

ICELAND

10 August 1981

"[The Government of Iceland declares] in accordance with article 14 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination which was opened for signature in New York on 7 March 1966, that Iceland recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of Iceland claiming to be victims of a violation by Iceland of any of the rights set forth in the Convention, with the reservation that the Committee shall not consider any communication from an individual or group of individuals unless the Committee has ascertained that the same matter is not being examined or has not been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement."

IRELAND

"With reference to article 14, paragraph 1, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, opened for signature at New York on 7 March 1966, Ireland recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, established by the afore-mentioned Convention to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within Ireland claiming to be victims of a violation by Ireland of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

Ireland recognizes that competence on the understanding that the said Committee shall not consider any communication without ascertaining that the same matter is not being considered or has not already been considered by another international body of investigation or settlement."

ITALY

5 May 1978

With reference to article 14, paragraph 1, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, opened for signature at New York on 7 March 1966, the Government of the Italian Republic recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, established by the afore-mentioned Convention, to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within Italian jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by Italy of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

The Government of the Italian Republic recognizes that competence on the understanding that the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination shall not consider any communication without ascertaining that the same matter is not being considered or has not already been considered by another international body of investigation or settlement.

KAZAKHSTAN

29 May 2008

"In accordance with article 14, paragraph 1, of the International convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination done at New York on December 21, 1965 the Republic of Kazakhstan hereby declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee of elimination of racial discrimination within its jurisdiction to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals who claim to be victims of a violation by the Republic of Kazakhstan of the provisions of the Convention."

LIECHTENSTEIN

18 March 2004

".....the Principality of Liechtenstein recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of Liechtenstein claiming to be victims of a violation by Liechtenstein of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

The Principality of Liechtenstein recognizes that competence on the understanding that the said Committee shall not consider any communication without ascertaining that the same matter is not being considered or has not already been considered under another international procedure of investigation or settlement.

Pursuant to article 14, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Constitutional Court has been designated as competent to receive and consider petitions from individuals and groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of Liechtenstein who claim to be victims of a violation of any of the rights set forth in the Convention."

LUXEMBOURG

22 July 1996

Pursuant to article 14 (1) of the [said Convention], Luxembourg declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by Luxembourg of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

Pursuant to article 14 (2) of the [said Convention], the "Commission spéciale permanente contre la discrimination", created in May 1996 pursuant to article 24 of the Law dated 27 July 1993 on the integration of aliens shall be competent to receive and consider petitions from individuals and groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of Luxembourg who claim to be victims of a violation of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

MALTA

16 December 1998

Malta declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from individuals subject to the jurisdiction of Malta who claim to be victims of a violation by Malta of any of the rights set forth in the Convention which results from situations or events occurring after the date of adoption of the present declaration, or from a decision relating to situations or events occurring after that date.

The Government of Malta recognizes this competence on the understanding that the Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination shall not consider any communication without ascertaining that the same matter is not being considered or has not already been considered by another international body of investigation or settlement."

MEXICO

15 March 2002

The United Mexican States recognizes as duly binding the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, established by article 8 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in its resolution 2106 (XX) of 21 December 1965 and opened for signature on 7 March 1966.

The United Mexican States declares, pursuant to article 14 of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by that State of any of the rights stipulated in the Convention.

Accordingly, in exercise of the power vested in me under article 89, subparagraph X, of the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States and in accordance with article 5 of the Conclusion of Treaties Act, I hereby issue this instrument of acceptance, the Declaration on Recognition of the Competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, as set out in the Declaration adopted by the Senate of the Distinguished Congress of the Union, and promise, on behalf of the Mexican Nation, to implement it, uphold it and ensure that it is implemented and upheld.

MONACO

6 November 2001

We hereby declare that we recognize the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and examine communications from individuals or groups of individuals under its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by the Principality of Monaco of any of the rights set forth in the said Convention, such competence to be exercised only when all domestic remedies have been exhausted, and we pledge our word as Prince and promise, on behalf of ourselves and our successors, to observe and execute it faithfully and loyally.

MONTENEGRO

Confirmed upon succession :

"By affirming its commitment to establish the principles of the rule of law and promote and protect human rights, the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia recognizes the competence of the Committee on the elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider complaints submitted by individuals and groups alleging violations of rights guaranteed under the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia determines the competence of the Federal Constitutional Court to accept and consider, within its domestic legal system, the complaints submitted by individuals and groups under the State jurisdiction, alleging to have been victims of rights violations under the Convention, and who have exhausted all available legal means provided for by the national legislation."

MOROCCO

19 October 2006

In accordance with article 14 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Government of the Kingdom of Morocco declares that it recognizes, on the date of deposit of the present document, the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation, subsequent to the date of deposit of the present document, of any of the rights set forth in this Convention.

NETHERLANDS

In accordance with article 14, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination concluded at New York on 7 March 1966, the Kingdom of the Netherlands recognizes, for the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles, the competence of the Committee for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation, by the Kingdom of the Netherlands, of any of the rights set forth in the above-mentioned Convention.

NORWAY

23 January 1976

"The Norwegian Government recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of Norway claiming to be victims of a violation by Norway of any of the rights set forth in the International Convention of 21 December 1965 on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination according to article 14 of the said Convention, with the reservation that the Committee shall not consider any communication from an individual or group of individuals unless the Committee has ascertained that the same matter is not being examined or has not been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement."

PERU

27 November 1984

[The Government of the Republic of Peru declares] that, in accordance with its policy of full respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, without distinctions as to race, sex, language or religion, and with the aim of strengthening the international instruments on the subject, Peru recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction, who claim to be victims of violations of any of the rights set forth in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, in conformity with the provisions of article 14 of the Convention.

POLAND

1 December 1998

The Government of the Republic of Poland recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, established by the provisions of the afore-mentioned Convention, to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within jurisdiction of the Republic of Poland claiming, to be victims of a violation by the Republic of Poland of the rights set forth in the above Convention and concerning all deeds, decisions and facts which will occur after the day this Declaration has been deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

PORTUGAL

2 March 2000

".....The Government of Portugal recognises the competence of the Committee established under Article 14 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by the Republic of Portugal of any of the rights set forth in that Convention.

Portugal recognises such jurisdiction provided that the Committee does not consider any communication unless it is satisfied that the matter has neither been examined nor is it subject to appreciation by any other international body with powers of inquiry or decision.

Portugal indicates the High Commissioner for Immigration and Ethnic Minorities as the body with competence to receive and consider petitions from individuals and groups of individuals that claim to be victims of violation of any of the rights set forth in the Convention".

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

5 March 1997

"The Government of the Republic of Korea recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of the Republic of Korea claiming to be victims of a violation by the Republic of Korea of any of the rights set forth in the said Convention."

ROMANIA

21 March 2003

"Romania declares, in accordance with article 14 paragraph 1 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from persons within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by Romania of any of the rights set forth in the Convention, to which Romania acceded by Decree no. 345 of 1970.

Without prejudice to the article 14 paragraphs 1 and 2 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Romania considers that the mentioned provisions do not confer to the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination the competence of examining communications of persons invoking the existence and infringement of collective rights.

The body which is competent in Romania, according to domestic law, to receive and to examine communications in accordance with article 14 paragraph 2 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination is the National Council for Combating Discrimination established by the Government Decision no. 1194 of 2001."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

1 October 1991

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications, in respect of situations and events occurring after the adoption of the present declaration, from individuals or groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of the USSR claiming to be victims of a violation by the USSR of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

SAN MARINO

22 February 2008

The Republic of San Marino, in accordance with article 14 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by the Republic of San Marino of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

SENEGAL

3 December 1982

In accordance with [article 14], the Government of Senegal declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee (on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination) to receive and consider communications from individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by Senegal of any of the rights set forth in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

SERBIA

Confirmed upon succession :

"By affirming its commitment to establish the principles of the rule of law and promote and protect human rights, the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia recognizes the competence of the Committee on the elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider complaints submitted by individuals and groups alleging violations of rights guaranteed under the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia determines the competence of the Federal Constitutional Court to accept and consider, within its domestic legal system, the complaints submitted by individuals and groups under the State jurisdiction, alleging to have been victims of rights violations under the Convention, and who have exhausted all available legal means provided for by the national legislation."

SLOVAKIA

17 March 1995

The Slovak Republic, pursuant to article 14 of the Convention, recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

SLOVENIA

10 November 2001

"The Republic of Slovenia recognizes to the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination competence to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by the Republic of Slovenia of any of the rights set forth in the Convention, with the reservation that the Committee shall not consider any communications unless it has ascertained that the same matter has not been, and is not being, examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement."

SOUTH AFRICA

"The Republic of South Africa-

(a) declares that, for the purposes of paragraph 1 of article 14 of the Convention, it recognises the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within the Republic's jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by the Republic in any of the rights set forth in the Convention after having exhausted all domestic remedies and

(b) indicates that, for the purposes of paragraph 2 of article 14 of the Convention, the South African Human Rights Commission is the body within the Republic's national legal order which shall be competent to receive and consider petitions from individuals or groups of individuals within the Republic's jurisdiction who claim to be victims of any of the rights set forth in the Convention."

SPAIN

13 January 1998

[The Government of Spain] recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of Spain claiming to be victims of violations by the Spanish State of any of the rights set forth in that Convention.

Such competence shall be accepted only after appeals to national jurisdiction bodies have been exhausted, and it must be exercised within three months following the date of the final judicial decision.

SWEDEN

"Sweden recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of Sweden claiming to be victims of a violation by Sweden of any of the rights set forth in the Convention, with the reservation that the Committee shall not consider any communication from an individual or a group of individuals unless the Committee has ascertained that the same matter is not being examined or has not been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement."

SWITZERLAND

19 June 2003

... .Switzerland recognizes, pursuant to article 14, paragraph 1, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, concluded at New York on 21 December 1965, the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) to receive and consider communications under the above-mentioned provision, with the reservation that the Committee shall not consider any communication from an individual or group of individuals unless the Committee has ascertained that the same matter is not being examined or has not been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

22 December 1999

"The Republic of Macedonia declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communcations from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by the Republic of Macedonia of any of its rights set forth in this Convention, with the reservation that the Committee shall not consider any communication from individuals or groups of individuals, unless it has ascertained that the same matter has not been, and is not being, examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement."

UKRAINE

28 July 1992

In accordance with the article 14 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Racial Discrimination, Ukraine declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals [within its jurisdiction] claiming to be victims of a violation by [it] of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

URUGUAY

11 September 1972

The Government of Uruguay recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, under article 14 of the Convention.

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

22 September 2003

Pursuant to the provisions of article 14, paragraph 1 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination established under article 8 of the Convention to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of violations by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

Notes:

[1] Article 19 of the Convention provides that the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the twenty-seventh instrument of ratification or instrument of accession. On 5 December 1968, the Government of Poland deposited the twenty-seventh instrument. However, among those instruments there were some which contained a reservation and therefore were subject to the provisions of article 20 of the Convention allowing States to notify objections within ninety days from the date of circulation by the Secretary-General of the reservations. In respect of two such instruments, namely those of Kuwait and Spain, the ninety-day period had not yet expired on the date of deposit of the twenty-seventh instrument. The reservation contained in one further instrument, that of India, had not yet been circulated on that date, and the twenty-seventh instrument itself, that of Poland, contained a reservation; in respect of these two instruments the ninety-day period would only begin to run on the date of the Secretary-General's notification of their deposit. Therefore, in that notification, which was dated 13 December 1968, the Secretary-General called the attention of the interested States to the situation and stated the following:

"It appears from the provisions of article 20 of the Convention that it would not be possible to determine the legal effect of the four instruments in question pending the expiry of the respective periods of time mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

Having regard to the above-mentioned consideration, the Secretary-General is not at the present time in a position to ascertain the date of entry into force of the Convention."

Subsequently, in a notification dated 17 March 1969, the Secretary-General informed the interested States; (a) that within the period of ninety days from the date of his previous notification he had received an objection from one State to the reservation contained in the instrument of ratification by the Government of India; and (b) that the Convention, in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 19, had entered into force on 4 January 1969, i.e., on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit of the instrument of ratification of the Convention by the Government of Poland, which was the twenty-seventh instrument of ratification or instrument of accession deposited with the Secretary-General.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Supplement No. 14* (A/6014),p. 47.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 23 March 1973 with a reservation and a declaration. For the text of the reservation and declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 883, p. 190.

Moreover, on 26 April 1984, the Government of the German Democratic Republic had made an objection with regard to the ratification made by the Government of the Democratic Kampuchea. For the text of the objection, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1355, p. 327.

See also note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 15 April 1966 and 2 October 1967, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 7 October 1966 and 29 December 1966, respectively, with reservations. Subsequently, on 12 March 1984, the Government of Czechoslovakia made an objection to the ratification by Democratic Kampuchea. Further, by a notification received on 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 22 made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification. For the text of the reservations and the objection, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 660, p. 276 and vol. 1350, p. 386, respectively. See also note 14 in this chapter and note 1 under “Czech Republic” and note 1 under “Slovakia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] In a communication received on 4 October 1972, the Government of Denmark notified the Secretary-General that it withdrew the reservation made with regard to the implementation on the Faroe Islands of the Convention. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 820, p. 457.

The legislation by which the Convention has been implemented on the Faroe Islands entered into force by 1 November 1972, from which date the withdrawal of the above reservation became effective.

[7] See note 1 under “Germany” regarding Berlin (West) in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] See note 1 under “Namibia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the preliminary pages in the front matter of this volume.

[11] On 27 April 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General that the Convention would apply to Macao.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Macao from Portugal and China (see note 3 under “China” and note 1 under “Portgual” in the Historical Information section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with the reservation made by China will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[12] On 10 June 1997, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from the Governments of the United Kingdom and China (see also note 2 under “China” and note 2 under “United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland” regarding Hong Kong in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with the reservation made by China will also apply to the Hong Kong special Administrative Region.

In addition, the notification made by the Government of China contained the following declarations:

1. ...

2. The reservation of the People's Republic of China on behalf of the the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region interprets the requirement in article 6 concerning "reparation and satisfaction" as being fulfilled if one or other of these forms of redress is made available and interprets "satisfaction" as including any form of redress effective to bring the discriminatory conduct to an end.

[13] In its instrument of ratification, the Government of the United Kingdom specified that the ratification also applied to the following territories: Associated States (Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, Saint Christopher Nevis Anguilla and Saint Lucia) and Territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom, as well as the State of Brunei, the Kingdom of Tonga and the British Solomon Islands Protectorate.

[14] The Yemen Arab Republic had acceded to the Convention on 6 April 1989 with the following reservation:

Reservations in respect of article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii).

In this regard, the Secretary-General received on 30 April 1990, from the Government of Czechoslovakia the following objection:

"The Czech and Slovak Federal Republic considers the reservations of the Government of Yemen with respect to article 5 (c) and articles 5 (d) (iv), (vi), and (vii) of [the Convention], as incompatible with the object and purpose of this Convention."

See also note 1 under “Yemen” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[15] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 July 1969, the Government of Israel declared:

"[The Government of Israel] has noted the political character of the declaration made by the Government of Iraq on signing the above Convention.

In the view of the Government of Israel, the Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Iraq an attitude of complete reciprocity. Moreover, it is the view of the Government of Israel that no legal relevance can be attached to those Iraqi statements which purport to represent the views of the other States".

Except for the omission of the last sentence, identical communica- tions in essence, *mutatis mutandis* , were received by the Secretary-General from the Government of Israel as follows: on 29 December 1966 in respect of the declaration made by the Government of the United Arab Republic upon signature (see also note 17); on 16 August 1968 in respect of the declaration made by the Government of Libya upon accession; on 12 December 1968 in respect of the declaration made by the Government of Kuwait upon accession; on 9 July 1969 in respect of the declaration made by the Government of Syria upon accession; on 21 April 1970 made in respect of the declaration made by Government of Iraq upon ratification with the following statement: "With regard to the political declaration in the guise of a reservation made on the occasion of the ratification of the above Treaty, the Government of Israel wishes to refer to its objection circulated by the Secretary-General in his letter [. . .] and to maintain that objection."; on 12 February 1973 in respect of the declaration made by the Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen upon accession; on 25 September 1974 in respect of the declaration made by the United Arab Emirates upon accession and on 25 June 1990 in rthe reservation made by Bahrain upon accession.

[16] In communications received on 8 March, 19 and 20 April 1989, the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, respectively, notified the Secretary-General that they had decided to withdraw the reservations relating to article 22. For the texts of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 676, p. 397, vol. 81, p. 392 and vol.77, p. 435.

[17] On 24 June 1992, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 22 made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 60, p. 270.

[18] None of the States concerned having objected to the reservation by the end of a period of ninety days after the date when it was circulated by the Secretary-General, the said reservation is deemed to have been permitted in accordance with the provisions of article 20 (1).

[19] In a notification received on 18 January 1980, the Government of Egypt informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the declaration it had made in respect of Israel. For the text of the declaration see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 60, p. 318. The notification indicates 25 January 1980 as the effective date of the withdrawal.

[20] In a communication received subsequently, the Government of France indicated that the first paragraph of the declaration did not purport to limit the obligations under the Convention in respect of the French Government, but only to record the latter's interpretation of article 4 of the Convention.

[21] In a communication received on 13 September 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation in respect to article 22 of the Convention made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 60, p. 310.

[22] In a communication received on 24 February 1969, the Government of Pakistan notified the Secretary-General that it "has decided not to accept the reservation made by the Government of India in her instrument of ratification".

[23] In a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation concerning article 22 made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 60, p. 289.

[24] On 16 October 1997, the Government of Poland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with regard to article 22 of the Convention made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 660, p. 195.

[25] On 19 August 1998, the Government of Romania notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation made with regard to article 22 of the Convention made upon accession. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 763, p. 362.

[26] In a communication received in 15 December 2008, the Government of Rwanda notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of the reservation made upon accession to the Convention. The text of the reservation reads as follows:

The Rwandese Republic does not consider itself as bound by article 22 of the Convention.

[27] On 22 October 1999, the Government of Spain informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation in respect of article XXII made upon accession. For the texte of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 660, p. 316.

[28] By a notification received on 28 October 1977, the Government of Tonga informed the Secretary-General that it has decided to withdraw only those reservations made upon accession relating to article 5 (c) in so far as it relates to elections, and reservations relating to articles 2, 3 and 5 (e) (v), in so far as these articles relate to education and training. For the text of the original reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 829, p. 371.

[29] The first ten declarations recognizing the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination took effect on 3 December 1982, date of the deposit of the tenth declaration, according to article 14, paragraph 1 of the Convention.

2. a) Amendment to article 8 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination

New York, 15 January 1992

NOT YET IN FORCE: see paragraph 4 of the Decision of the State Parties which reads as follows: "The amendment shall enter into force when it has been approved by the General Assembly and accepted by a two thirds majority of States parties which shall have so notified the Secretary-General as depositary.".

STATUS: Parties: 43.

TEXT: Doc. CERD/sp/45.

Note: The amendment proposed by the Government of Australia and circulated by the Secretary-General under cover of depositary notification C.N.285.1991.TREATIES-4 of 20 December 1991, was adopted by the States Parties to the Convention at their Fourteenth Meeting and submitted to the General Assembly in accordance with article 23 of the Convention. The General Assembly endorsed the said amendment at its Forty-seventh session by resolution 47/111 of 16 December 1992.

Participant	*Acceptance(A)*
Australia	15 Oct 1993 A
Bahamas	31 Mar 1994 A
Bahrain	29 Jun 2000 A
Belize	5 Mar 2004 A
Bulgaria	2 Mar 1995 A
Burkina Faso	9 Aug 1993 A
Canada	8 Feb 1995 A
China	10 Jul 2002 A
Colombia	5 Oct 1999 A
Costa Rica	13 Dec 2000 A
Cuba	21 Nov 1996 A
Cyprus	28 Sep 1998 A
Czech Republic	6 Aug 2002 A
Denmark	3 Sep 1993 A
Ecuador	26 Sep 2006 A
Finland	9 Feb 1994 A
France	1 Sep 1994 A
Germany	8 Oct 1996 A
Guinea	31 May 2000 A
Holy See	14 Mar 2002 A
Iceland	14 Mar 2001 A
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	8 Nov 2005 A
Iraq	25 May 2001 A
Ireland	29 Dec 2000 A
Liberia	16 Sep 2005 A
Liechtenstein	28 Apr 2000 A
Luxembourg	12 Aug 2004 A
Mexico	16 Sep 1996 A
Netherlands[1]	24 Jan 1995 A
New Zealand[2]	8 Oct 1993 A
Norway	6 Oct 1993 A
Poland	23 Aug 2002 A
Republic of Korea	30 Nov 1993 A
Saudi Arabia	28 Feb 2003 A
Seychelles	23 Jul 1993 A
Slovakia	9 Aug 2006 A
Sweden	14 May 1993 A
Switzerland	16 Dec 1996 A
Syrian Arab Republic	25 Feb 1998 A
Trinidad and Tobago	23 Aug 1993 A
Ukraine	17 Jun 1994 A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	7 Feb 1994 A
Zimbabwe	10 Apr 1997 A

Notes:

[1] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the in the front matter of this volume.

[2] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the in the front matter of this volume.

3. INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS

New York, 16 December 1966

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 January 1976, in accordance with article 27.[1]
REGISTRATION: 3 January 1976, No. 14531.
STATUS: Signatories: 69. Parties: 160.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 993, p. 3; depositary notification C.N.781.2001.TREATIES-6 of 5 October 2001 [Proposal of correction to the original of the Covenant (Chinese authentic text) and C.N.7.2002.TREATIES-1 of 3 January 2002 [Rectification of the original of the Covenant (Chinese authentic text)].

Note: The Covenant was opened for signature at New York on 19 December 1966.

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Afghanistan		24 Jan 1983 a
Albania		4 Oct 1991 a
Algeria	10 Dec 1968	12 Sep 1989
Angola		10 Jan 1992 a
Argentina	19 Feb 1968	8 Aug 1986
Armenia		13 Sep 1993 a
Australia	18 Dec 1972	10 Dec 1975
Austria	10 Dec 1973	10 Sep 1978
Azerbaijan		13 Aug 1992 a
Bahamas	4 Dec 2008	23 Dec 2008
Bahrain		27 Sep 2007 a
Bangladesh		5 Oct 1998 a
Barbados		5 Jan 1973 a
Belarus	19 Mar 1968	12 Nov 1973
Belgium	10 Dec 1968	21 Apr 1983
Belize	6 Sep 2000	
Benin		12 Mar 1992 a
Bolivia		12 Aug 1982 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[3]		1 Sep 1993 d
Brazil		24 Jan 1992 a
Bulgaria	8 Oct 1968	21 Sep 1970
Burkina Faso		4 Jan 1999 a
Burundi		9 May 1990 a
Cambodia[4,5]	17 Oct 1980	26 May 1992 a
Cameroon		27 Jun 1984 a
Canada		19 May 1976 a
Cape Verde		6 Aug 1993 a
Central African Republic		8 May 1981 a
Chad		9 Jun 1995 a
Chile	16 Sep 1969	10 Feb 1972
China[6,7,8]	27 Oct 1997	27 Mar 2001
Colombia	21 Dec 1966	29 Oct 1969
Comoros	25 Sep 2008	
Congo		5 Oct 1983 a
Costa Rica	19 Dec 1966	29 Nov 1968
Côte d'Ivoire		26 Mar 1992 a
Croatia[3]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba	28 Feb 2008	
Cyprus	9 Jan 1967	2 Apr 1969
Czech Republic[9]		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		14 Sep 1981 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo		1 Nov 1976 a
Denmark	20 Mar 1968	6 Jan 1972
Djibouti		5 Nov 2002 a
Dominica		17 Jun 1993 a
Dominican Republic		4 Jan 1978 a
Ecuador	29 Sep 1967	6 Mar 1969
Egypt	4 Aug 1967	14 Jan 1982
El Salvador	21 Sep 1967	30 Nov 1979
Equatorial Guinea		25 Sep 1987 a
Eritrea		17 Apr 2001 a
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Ethiopia		11 Jun 1993 a
Finland	11 Oct 1967	19 Aug 1975
France		4 Nov 1980 a
Gabon		21 Jan 1983 a
Gambia		29 Dec 1978 a
Georgia		3 May 1994 a
Germany[10]	9 Oct 1968	17 Dec 1973
Ghana	7 Sep 2000	7 Sep 2000
Greece		16 May 1985 a
Grenada		6 Sep 1991 a
Guatemala		19 May 1988 a
Guinea	28 Feb 1967	24 Jan 1978

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Guinea-Bissau		2 Jul 1992 a
Guyana	22 Aug 1968	15 Feb 1977
Honduras	19 Dec 1966	17 Feb 1981
Hungary	25 Mar 1969	17 Jan 1974
Iceland	30 Dec 1968	22 Aug 1979
India		10 Apr 1979 a
Indonesia		23 Feb 2006 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	4 Apr 1968	24 Jun 1975
Iraq	18 Feb 1969	25 Jan 1971
Ireland	1 Oct 1973	8 Dec 1989
Israel	19 Dec 1966	3 Oct 1991
Italy	18 Jan 1967	15 Sep 1978
Jamaica	19 Dec 1966	3 Oct 1975
Japan	30 May 1978	21 Jun 1979
Jordan	30 Jun 1972	28 May 1975
Kazakhstan	2 Dec 2003	24 Jan 2006
Kenya		1 May 1972 a
Kuwait		21 May 1996 a
Kyrgyzstan		7 Oct 1994 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic	7 Dec 2000	13 Feb 2007
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 a
Lebanon		3 Nov 1972 a
Lesotho		9 Sep 1992 a
Liberia	18 Apr 1967	22 Sep 2004
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		15 May 1970 a
Liechtenstein		10 Dec 1998 a
Lithuania		20 Nov 1991 a
Luxembourg	26 Nov 1974	18 Aug 1983
Madagascar	14 Apr 1970	22 Sep 1971
Malawi		22 Dec 1993 a
Maldives		19 Sep 2006 a
Mali		16 Jul 1974 a
Malta	22 Oct 1968	13 Sep 1990
Mauritania		17 Nov 2004 a
Mauritius		12 Dec 1973 a
Mexico		23 Mar 1981 a
Monaco	26 Jun 1997	28 Aug 1997
Mongolia	5 Jun 1968	18 Nov 1974
Montenegro[11]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	19 Jan 1977	3 May 1979
Namibia		28 Nov 1994 a
Nepal		14 May 1991 a
Netherlands[12]	25 Jun 1969	11 Dec 1978
New Zealand[13]	12 Nov 1968	28 Dec 1978
Nicaragua		12 Mar 1980 a
Niger		7 Mar 1986 a
Nigeria		29 Jul 1993 a
Norway	20 Mar 1968	13 Sep 1972
Pakistan	3 Nov 2004	17 Apr 2008
Panama	27 Jul 1976	8 Mar 1977
Papua New Guinea		21 Jul 2008 a
Paraguay		10 Jun 1992 a
Peru	11 Aug 1977	28 Apr 1978
Philippines	19 Dec 1966	7 Jun 1974
Poland	2 Mar 1967	18 Mar 1977
Portugal[6]	7 Oct 1976	31 Jul 1978
Republic of Korea		10 Apr 1990 a
Republic of Moldova		26 Jan 1993 a
Romania	27 Jun 1968	9 Dec 1974
Russian Federation	18 Mar 1968	16 Oct 1973
Rwanda		16 Apr 1975 a
San Marino		18 Oct 1985 a
Sao Tome and Principe	31 Oct 1995	
Senegal	6 Jul 1970	13 Feb 1978
Serbia[3]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		5 May 1992 a
Sierra Leone		23 Aug 1996 a
Slovakia[9]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[3]		6 Jul 1992 d
Solomon Islands[14]		17 Mar 1982 d
Somalia		24 Jan 1990 a
South Africa	3 Oct 1994	
Spain	28 Sep 1976	27 Apr 1977
Sri Lanka		11 Jun 1980 a
St. Vincent and the Grenadines		9 Nov 1981 a
Sudan		18 Mar 1986 a
Suriname		28 Dec 1976 a
Swaziland		26 Mar 2004 a
Sweden	29 Sep 1967	6 Dec 1971
Switzerland		18 Jun 1992 a
Syrian Arab Republic		21 Apr 1969 a
Tajikistan		4 Jan 1999 a
Thailand		5 Sep 1999 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of		18 Jan 1994 d

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Macedonia[3]		
Timor-Leste		16 Apr 2003 a
Togo		24 May 1984 a
Trinidad and Tobago		8 Dec 1978 a
Tunisia	30 Apr 1968	18 Mar 1969
Turkey	15 Aug 2000	23 Sep 2003
Turkmenistan		1 May 1997 a
Uganda		21 Jan 1987 a
Ukraine	20 Mar 1968	12 Nov 1973
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[8,15]	16 Sep 1968	20 May 1976
United Republic of Tanzania		11 Jun 1976 a
United States of America	5 Oct 1977	
Uruguay	21 Feb 1967	1 Apr 1970
Uzbekistan		28 Sep 1995 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	24 Jun 1969	10 May 1978
Viet Nam		24 Sep 1982 a
Yemen[16]		9 Feb 1987 a
Zambia		10 Apr 1984 a
Zimbabwe		13 May 1991 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto and territorial applications, see hereinafter.)

AFGHANISTAN

Declaration:

The presiding body of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan declares that the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 3 of article 48 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and provisions of paragraphs 1 and 3 of article 26 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, according to which some countries cannot join the aforesaid Covenants, contradicts the International character of the aforesaid Treaties. Therefore, according to the equal rights of all States to sovereignty, both Covenants should be left open for the purpose of the participation of all States.

ALGERIA[17]

Interpretative declarations:

1. The Algerian Government interprets article 1, which is common to the two Covenants, as in no case impairing the inalienable right of all peoples to self-determination and to control over their natural wealth and resources.

It further considers that the maintenance of the State of dependence of certain territories referred to in article 1, paragraph 3, of the two Covenants and in article 14 of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights is contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations, to the Charter of the Organization and to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)].

2. The Algerian Government interprets the provisions of article 8 of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and article 22 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as making the law the framework for action by the State with respect to the organization and exercise of the right to organize.

3. The Algerian Government considers that the provisions of article 13, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights can in no case impair its right freely to organize its educational system.

4. The Algerian Government interprets the provisions of article 23, paragraph 4, of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights regarding the rights and responsibilities of spouses as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution as in no way impairing the essential foundations of the Algerian legal system.

BAHAMAS

Declaration

"The Government of the Bahamas interprets non-discrimination as to national origin as not necessarily implying an obligation on States automatically to guarantee to foreigners the same rights as to their nationals. The term should be understood to refer to the elimination of any arbitrary behavior but not of differences in treatment based on objective and reasonable considerations, in conformity with principles prevailing in democratic societies."

BAHRAIN

Declaration:

"The Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain declares that its accession to sub-paragraph (d) of paragraph (1) of article (8) of this Covenant will not prejudice its right to prohibit strikes in vitally important utilities."

BANGLADESH[18]

Declarations:

"Article 1:

It is the understanding of the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh that the words "the right of self-determination of Peoples" appearing in this article apply in the historical context of colonial rule, administration, foreign domination, occupation and similar situations.

Articles 2 and 3:

The Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh will implement articles 2 and 3 in so far as they relate to equality between man and woman, in accordance with the relevant provisions of its Constitution and in particular, in respect to certain aspects of economic rights viz. law of inheritance.

Articles 7 and 8:

The Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh will apply articles 7 and 8 under the conditions and in conformity with the procedures established in the Constitution and the relevant legislation of Bangladesh.

Articles 10 and 13:

While the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh accepts the provisions embodied in articles 10 and 13 of the Covenant in principle, it will implement the said provisions in a progressive manner, in keeping with the existing economic conditions and the development plans of the country."

BARBADOS

"The Government of Barbados states that it reserves the right to postpone-

"(a) The application of sub-paragraph (a) (1) of article 7 of the Covenant in so far as it concerns the provision of equal pay to men and women for equal work;

"(b) The application of article 10 (2) in so far as it relates to the special protection to be accorded mothers during a reasonable period during and after childbirth; and

"(c) The application of article 13 (2) (a) of the Covenant, in so far as it relates to primary education; since, while the Barbados Government fully accepts the principles embodied in the same articles and undertakes to take the necessary steps to apply them in their entirety, the problems of implementation are such that full application of the principles in question cannot be guaranteed at this stage."

BELARUS[19]

BELGIUM

Interpretative declarations:

1. With respect to article 2, paragraph 2, the Belgian Government interprets non-discrimination as to national origin as not necessarily implying an obligation on States automatically to guarantee to foreigners the same rights as to their nationals. The term should be understood to refer to the elimination of any arbitrary behaviour but not of differences in treatment based on objective and reasonable considerations, in conformity with the principles prevailing in democratic societies.
2. With respect to article 2, paragraph 3, the Belgian Government understands that this provision cannot infringe the principle of fair compensation in the event of expropriation or nationalization.

BULGARIA

"The People's Republic of Bulgaria deems it necessary to underline that the provisions of article 48, paragraphs 1 and 3, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and article 26, paragraphs 1 and 3, of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, under which a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become parties to the Covenants, are of a discriminatory nature. These provisions are inconsistent with the very nature of the Covenants, which are universal in character and should be open for accession by all States. In accordance with the principle of sovereign equality, no State has the right to bar other States from becoming parties to a covenant of this kind."

CHINA

Statement made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The signature that the Taiwan authorities affixed, by usurping the name of "China", to the [said Covenant] on 5 October 1967, is illegal and null and void.

Statement made upon ratification:

In accordance with the Decision made by the Standing Committee of the Ninth National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China at its Twentieth Session, the President of the People's Republic of China hereby ratifies *The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* , which was signed by Mr. Qin Huasun on behalf of the People's Republic of China on 27 October 1997, and declares the following:

1. The application of Article 8.1 (a) of the Covenant to the People's Republic of China shall be consistent with the relevant provisions of the *Constitution of the People's Republic of China, Trade Union Law of the People's Republic of China* and *Labor Law of the People's Republic of China* ;
2. In accordance with the official notes addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations by the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations on 20 June 1997 and 2 December 1999 respectively, the *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* shall be applicable to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and shall, pursuant to the provisions of the *Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China* and *the Basic Law of the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China* , be implemented through the respective laws of the two special administrative regions.

CONGO[20]

CUBA

Declaration:

The Republic of Cuba hereby declares that it was the Revolution that enabled its people to enjoy the rights set out in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America and its policy of hostility and aggression against Cuba constitute the most serious obstacle to the Cuban people's enjoyment of the rights set out in the Covenant.

The rights protected under this Covenant are enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic and in national legislation.

The State's policies and programmes guarantee the effective exercise and protection of these rights for all Cubans.

With respect to the scope and implementation of some of the provisions of this international instrument, Cuba will make such reservations or interpretative declarations as it may deem appropriate.

CZECH REPUBLIC[9]

DENMARK[21]

"The Government of Denmark cannot, for the time being, undertake to comply entirely with the provisions of article 7 (d) on remuneration for public holidays."

EGYPT

Declaration:

... Taking into consideration the provisions of the Islamic Sharia and the fact that they do not conflict with the text annexed to the instrument, we accept, support and ratifiy it ... .

FRANCE

Declarations:

(1) The Government of the Republic considers that, in accordance with Article 103 of the Charter of the United Nations, in case of conflict between its obligations under the Covenant and its obligations under the Charter (especially Articles 1 and 2 thereof), its obligations under the Charter will prevail.

(2) The Government of the Republic declares that articles 6, 9, 11 and 13 are not to be interpreted as derogating from provisions governing the access of aliens to employment or as establishing residence requirements for the allocation of certain social benefits.

(3) The Government of the Republic declares that it will implement the provisions of article 8 in respect of the right to strike in conformity with article 6, paragraph 4, of the European Social Charter according to the interpretation thereof given in the annex to that Charter.

GUINEA

In accordance with the principle whereby all States whose policies are guided by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations are entitled to become parties to covenants affecting the interests of the international community, the Government of the Republic of Guinea considers that the provisions of article 26, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights are contrary to the principle of the universality of international treaties and the democratization of international relations.

The Government of the Republic of Guinea likewise considers that article 1, paragraph 3, and the provisions of article 14 of that instrument are contrary to the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, in general, and United Nations resolutions on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, in particular.

The above provisions are contrary to the Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States contained in General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), pursuant to which every State has the duty to promote realization of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in order to put an end to colonialism.

HUNGARY

Upon signature:

"The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic declares that paragraph 1 of article 26 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and paragraph 1 of article 48 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights according to which certain States may not become signatories to the said Covenants are of a discriminatory nature and are contrary to the basic principle of international law that all States are entitled to become signatories to general multilateral treaties. These discriminatory provisions are incompatible with the objectives and purposes of the Covenants."

Upon ratification:

"The Presidential Council of the Hungarian People's Republic declares that the provisions of article 48, paragraphs 1 and 3, of [...] the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and article 26, paragraphs 1 and 3, of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights are inconsistent with the universal character of the Covenants. It follows from the principle of sovereign equality of States that the Covenants should be open for participation by all States without any discrimination or limitation."

INDIA

Declarations:

"I. With reference to article 1 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Government of the Republic of India declares that the words `the right of self-determination' appearing in [this article] apply only to the peoples under foreign domination and that these words do not apply to sovereign independent States or to a section of a people or nation--which is the essence of national integrity.

"II. With reference to article 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Government of the Republic of India takes the position that the provisions of the article shall be so applied as to be in consonance with the provisions of clauses (3) to (7) of article 22 of the Constitution of India. Further under the Indian Legal System, there is no enforceable right to compensation for persons claiming to be victims of unlawful arrest or detention against the State.

"III. With respect to article 13 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Government of the Republic of India reserves its right to apply its law relating to foreigners.

"IV. With reference to articles 4 and 8 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and articles 12, 19 (3), 21 and 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights the Government of the Republic of India declares that the provisions of the said [article] shall be so applied as to be in conformity with the provisions of article 19 of the Constitution of India.

"V. With reference to article 7 (c) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Government of the Republic of India declares that the provisions of the said article shall be so applied as to be in conformity with the provisions of article 16(4) of the Constitution of India."

INDONESIA

Declaration:

"With reference to Article 1 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Government of [the] Republic of Indonesia declares that, consistent with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States, and the relevant paragraph of the Vienna Declaration and Program of Action of 1993, the words "the right of self-determination" appearing in this article do not apply to a section of people within a sovereign independent state and can not be construed as authorizing or encouraging any action which would dismember or impair, totally or in part, the territorial integrity or political unity of sovereign and independent states."

IRAQ[22]

Upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The entry of the Republic of Iraq as a party to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights shall in no way signify recognition of Israel nor shall it entail any obligation towards Israel under the said two Covenants."

"The entry of the Republic of Iraq as a party to the above two Covenants shall not constitute entry by it as a party to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights."

Upon ratification:

"Ratification by Iraq ... shall in no way signify recognition of Israel nor shall it be conducive to entry with her into such dealings as are regulated by the said [Covenant]."

IRELAND

Reservations:

"Article 2, paragraph 2

In the context of Government policy to foster, promote and encourage the use of the Irish language by all appropriate means, Ireland reserves the right to require, or give favourable consideration to, a knowledge of the Irish language for certain occupations.

Article 13, paragraph 2 (a)

Ireland recognises the inalienable right and duty of parents to provide for the education of children, and, while recognising the State's obligations to provide for free primary education and requiring that children receive a certain minimum education, nevertheless reserves the right to allow parents to provide for the education of their children in their homes provided that these minimum standards are observed."

JAPAN

Reservations and declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"1. In applying the provisions of paragraph (d) of article 7 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Japan reserves the right not be bound by 'remuneration for public holidays' referred to in the said provisions.

"2. Japan reserves the right not to be bound by the provisions of sub-paragraph (d) of paragraph 1 of article 8 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, except in relation to the sectors in which the right referred to in the said provisions is accorded in accordance with the laws and regulations of Japan at the time of ratification of the Covenant by the Government of Japan.

"3. In applying the provisions of sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) of paragraph 2 of article 13 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Japan reserves the right not to be bound by `in particular by the progressive introduction of free education' referred to in the said provisions.

"4. Recalling the position taken by the Government of Japan, when ratifying the Convention (No. 87) concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise, that `the police' referred to in article 9 of the said Convention be interpreted to include the fire service of Japan, the Government of Japan declares that `members of the police' referred to in paragraph 2 of article 8 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights as well as in paragraph 2 of article 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights be interpreted to include fire service personnel of Japan."

KENYA

"While the Kenya Government recognizes and endorses the principles laid down in paragraph 2 of article 10 of the Covenant, the present circumstances obtaining in Kenya do not render necessary or expedient the imposition of those principles by legislation."

KUWAIT

Interpretative declaration regarding article 2, paragraph 2, and article 3:

Although the Government of Kuwait endorses the worthy principles embodied in article 2, paragraph 2, and article 3 as consistent with the provisions of the Kuwait Constitution in general and of its article 29 in particular, it declares that the rights to which the articles refer must be exercised within the limits set by Kuwaiti law.

Interpretative declaration regarding article 9:

The Government of Kuwait declares that while Kuwaiti legislation safeguards the rights of all Kuwaiti and non-Kuwaiti workers, social security provisions apply only to Kuwaitis.

Reservation concerning article 8, paragraph 1 (d):

The Government of Kuwait reserves the right not to apply the provisions of article 8, paragraph 1 (d).

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA[22]

"The acceptance and the accession to this Covenant by the Libyan Arab Republic shall in no way signify a recognition of Israel or be conducive to entry by the Libyan Arab Republic into such dealings with Israel as are regulated by the Covenant."

MADAGASCAR

The Government of Madagascar states that it reserves the right to postpone the application of article 13, paragraph 2, of the Covenant, more particularly in so far as relates to primary education, since, while the Malagasy Government fully accepts the principles embodied in the said paragraph and undertakes to take the necessary steps to apply them in their entirety at the earliest possible date, the problems of implementation, and particularly the financial implications, are such that full application of the principles in question cannot be guaranteed at this stage.

MALTA[23]

"Article 13 - The Government of Malta declares that it is in favour of upholding the principle affirmed in the words" and to ensure the religious and moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions". However, having regard to the fact that the population of Malta is overwhelmingly Roman Catholic, it is difficult also in view of limited financial and human resources, to provide such education in accordance with a particular religious or moral belief in cases of small groups, which cases are very exceptional in Malta."

MEXICO

Interpretative statement:

The Government of Mexico accedes to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights with the understanding that article 8 of the Covenant shall be applied in the Mexican Republic under the conditions and in conformity with the procedure established in the applicable provisions of the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States and the relevant implementing legislation.

MONACO

Interpretative declarations and reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Princely Government declares that it interprets the principle of non-discrimination on the grounds of national origin, embodied in article 2, paragraph 2, as not necessarily implying an automatic obligation on the part of States to guarantee foreigners the same rights as their nationals.

The Princely Government declares that articles 6, 9, 11 and 13 should not be constituting an impediment to provisions governing access to work by foreigners or fixing conditions of residence for the granting of certain social benefits.

The Princely Government declares that it considers article 8, paragraph 1, subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) on the exercise of trade union rights to be compatible with the appropriate legislative provisions regarding the formalities, conditions and procedures designed to ensure effective trade union representation and to promote harmonious labour relations.

The Princely Government declares that in implementing the provisions of article 8 relating to the exercise of the right to strike, it will take into account the requirements, conditions, limitations and restrictions which are prescribed by law and which are necessary in a democratic society in order to guarantee the rights and freedoms of others or to protect public order (*ordre public*), national security, public health or morals.

Article 8, paragraph 2, should be interpreted as applying to the members of the police force and agents of the State, the Commune and public enterprises.

MONGOLIA

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Mongolian People's Republic declares that the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 26 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and of paragraph 1 of article 48 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, under which a number of States cannot become parties to these Covenants, are of a discriminatory nature and considers that the Covenants, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, should be open for participation by all States concerned without any discrimination or limitation.

NETHERLANDS

Reservation with respect to Article 8, paragraph 1 (d)

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not accept this provision in the case of the Netherlands Antilles with regard to the latter's central and local government bodies." [The Kingdom of the Netherlands] clarify that although it is not certain whether the reservation [...] is necessary, [it] has preferred the form of a reservation to that of a declaration. In this way the Kingdom of the Netherlands wishes to ensure that the relevant obligation under the Covenant does not apply to the Kingdom as far as the Netherlands Antilles is concerned."

NEW ZEALAND[24]

"The Government of New Zealand reserves the right not [to] apply article 8 to the extent that existing legislative measures, enacted to ensure effective trade union representation and encourage orderly industrial relations, may not be fully compatible with that article.

...

NORWAY

Subject to reservations to article 8, paragraph 1 (d) "to the effect that the current Norwegian practice of referring labour conflicts to the State Wages Board (a permanent tripartite arbitral commission in matters of wages) by Act of Parliament for the particular conflict, shall not be considered incompatible with the right to strike, this right being fully recognised in Norway."

PAKISTAN[25,26]

Upon ratification

Reservation:

"Pakistan, with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of the rights recognized in the present Covenant, shall use all appropriate means to the maximum of its available resources."

ROMANIA

Upon signature:

The Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania declares that the provisions of article 26, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights are at variance with the principle that all States have the right to become parties to multilateral treaties governing matters of general interest.

Upon ratification:

(a) The State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the provisions of article 26 (1) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights are inconsistent with the principle that multilateral international treaties whose purposes concern the international community as a whole must be open to universal participation.

(b) The State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the maintenance in a state of dependence of certain territories referred to in articles 1 (3) and 14 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights is inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations and the instruments adopted by the Organization on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, including the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, adopted unanimously by the United Nations General Assembly in its resolution 2625 (XXV) of 1970, which solemnly proclaims the duty of States to promote the realization of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in order to bring a speedy end to colonialism.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 26 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and of paragraph 1 of article 48 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, under which a number of States cannot become parties to these Covenants, are of a discriminatory nature and considers that the Covenants, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, should be open for participation by all States concerned without any discrimination or limitation.

RWANDA[27]

SLOVAKIA[9]

SWEDEN

Sweden enters a reservation in connexion with article 7 (d) of the Covenant in the matter of the right to remuneration for public holidays.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC[22]

1. The accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to these two Covenants shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or entry into a relationship with it regarding any matter regulated by the said two Covenants.

2. The Syrian Arab Republic considers that paragraph 1 of article 26 of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and paragraph 1 of article 48 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights are incompatible with the purposes and objectives of the said Covenants, inasmuch as they do not allow all States, without distinction or discrimination, the opportunity to become parties to the said Covenants.

THAILAND

Interpretative declaration:

"The Government of the Kingdom of Thailand declares that the term "self-determination"as appears in Article 1 Paragraph 1 of the Covenant shall be interpreted as being compatible with that expressed in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, adopted by the World Conference on Human Rights on 25 June 1993."

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

In respect of article 8 (1) (d) and 8 (2):

"The Government of Trinidad and Tobago reserves the right to impose lawful and or reasonable restrictions on the exercise of the aforementioned rights by personnel engaged in essential services under the Industrial Relations Act or under any Statute replacing same which has been passed in accordance with the provisions of the Trinidad and Tobago Constitution.

TURKEY

Declarations and reservation:

The Republic of Turkey declares that; it will implement its obligations under the Covenant in accordance to the obligations under the Charter of the United Nations (especially Article 1 and 2 thereof).

The Republic of Turkey declares that it will implement the provisions of this Covenant only to the States with which it has diplomatic relations.

The Republic of Turkey declares that this Convention is ratified exclusively with regard to the national territory where the Constitution and the legal and administrative order of the Repubic of Turkey are applied.

The Republic of Turkey reserves the right to interpret and apply the provisions of the paragraph (3) and (4) of the Article 13 of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in accordance to the provisions under the Article 3, 14 and 42 of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey.

UKRAINE

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 26 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and of paragraph 1 of article 48 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, under which a number of States cannot become parties to these Covenants, are of a discriminatory nature and considers that the Covenants, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, should be open for participation by all States concerned without any discrimination or limitation.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Upon signature:

"First, the Government of the United Kingdom declare their understanding that, by virtue of article 103 of the Charter of the United Nations, in the event of any conflict between their obligations under article 1 of the Covenant and their obligations under the Charter (in particular, under articles 1, 2 and 73 thereof) their obligations under the Charter shall prevail.

"Secondly, the Government of the United Kingdom declare that they must reserve the right to postpone the application of sub-paragraph (a) (i) of article 7 of the Covenant in so far as it concerns the provision of equal pay to men and women for equal work, since, while they fully accept this principle and are pledged to work towards its complete application at the earliest possible time, the problems of implementation are such that complete application cannot be guaranteed at present.

"Thirdly, the Government of the United Kingdom declare that, in relation to article 8 of the Covenant, they must reserve the right not to apply sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 1 in Hong Kong, in so far as it may involve the right of trade unions not engaged in the same trade or industry to establish federations or confederations.

"Lastly, the Government of the United Kingdom declare that the provisions of the Covenant shall not apply to Southern Rhodesia unless and until they inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations that they are in a position to ensure that the obligations imposed by the Covenant in respect of that territory can be fully implemented."

Upon ratification:

"Firstly, the Government of the United Kingdom maintain their declaration in respect of article 1 made at the time of signature of the Covenant.

"The Government of the United Kingdom declare that for the purposes of article 2 (3) the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, the Gilbert Islands, the Pitcairn Islands Group, St. Helena and Dependencies, the Turks and Caicos Islands and Tuvalu are deloping countries.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right to interpret article 6 as not precluding the imposition of restrictions, based on place of birth or residence qualifications, on the taking of employment in any particular region or territory for the purpose of safeguarding the employment opportunities of workers in that region or territory.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right to postpone the application of sub-paragraph (i) of paragraph (a) of article 7, in so far as it concerns the provision of equal pay to men and women for equal work in the private sector in Jersey, Guernsey, the Isle of Man, Bermuda, Hong Kong and the Solomon Islands.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right not to apply sub-paragraph 1(b) of article 8 in Hong Kong.

"The Government of the United Kingdom while recognising the right of everyone to social security in accordance with article 9 reserve the right to postpone implementation of the right in the Cayman Islands and the Falkland Islands because of shortage of resources in these territories.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right to postpone the application of paragraph 1 of article 10 in regard to a small number of customary marriages in the Solomon Islands and the application of paragraph 2 of article 10 in so far as it concerns paid maternity leave in Bermuda and the Falkland Islands.

"The Government of the United Kingdom maintain the right to postpone the application of sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 2 of article 13, and article 14, in so far as they require compulsory primary education, in the Gilbert Islands, the Solomon Islands and Tuvalu.

"Lastly the Government of the United Kingdom declare that the provisions of the Covenant shall not apply to Southern Rhodesia unless and until they inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations that they are in a position to ensure that the obligations imposed by the Covenant in respect of that territory can be fully implemented."

VIET NAM

Declaration:

That the provisions of article 48, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and article 26, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, under which a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become parties to the Covenants, are of a discriminatory nature. The Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam considers that the Covenants, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, should be open for participation by all States without any discrimination or limitation.

YEMEN[16]

The accession of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen to this Covenant shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or serve as grounds for the establishment of relations of any sort with Israel.

ZAMBIA

Reservation:

The Government of the Republic of Zambia states that it reserves the right to postpone the application of article 13 (2) (a) of the Covenant, in so far as it relates to primary education; since, while the Government of the Republic of Zambia fully accepts the principles embodied in the same article and undertakes to take the necessary steps to apply them in their entirety, the problems of implementation, and particularly the financial implications, are such that full application of the principles in question cannot be guaranteed at this stage.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

CYPRUS

26 November 2003

With regard to the declarations made by Turkey upon ratification:

".....the Government of the Republic of Cyprus wishes to express its objection with respect to the declarations entered by the Republic of Turkey upon ratification on 23 September 2003, of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, New York, 16 December 1966.

The Government of the Republic of Cyprus considers that the declaration relating to the implementation of the provisions of the Covenant only to the States with which the Republic of Turkey has diplomatic relations, and the declaration that the Convention is "ratified exclusively with regard to the national territory where the Constitution and the legal and administrative order of the Republic of Turkey are applied" amount to reservations. These reservations create uncertainty as to the States Parties in respect of which Turkey is undertaking the obligations in the Covenant, and raise doubt as to the commitment of Turkey to the object and purpose of the said Covenant.

The Government of the Republic of Cyprus objects to the said reservations entered by the Republic of Turkey and states that these reservations or the objection to them shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Cyprus and the Republic of Turkey."

DENMARK

17 March 2005

With regard to the declaration made by Paksitan upon signature:

"The Government of Denmark has examined the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon [signing] the 1966 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The application of the provisions of the said Covenant has been made subject to the provisions of the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. This general formulation makes it unclear to what extent the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant and therefore raises doubt as to the commitment of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Denmark considers that the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the international Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in substance constitutes a reservation and that this reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

For the above-mentioned reasons, the Government of Denmark objects to this declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and Denmark without Pakistan benefiting from her declaration."

FINLAND

25 July 1997

With regard to the declarations and the reservation made by Kuwait upon accession:

"The Government of Finland notes that according to the interpretative declaration regarding article 2, paragraph 2, and article 3 the application of these articles of the Covenant is in a general way subjected to national law. The Government of Finland considers this interpretative declaration as a reservation of a general kind. The Government of Finland is of the view that such a general reservation raises doubts as to the commitment of Kuwait to the object and purpose of the Covenant and would recall that a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant shall not be permitted.

The Government of Finland also considers the interpretative declaration to article 9 as a reservation and regards this reservation as well as the reservation to article 8, paragraph 1(d), as problematic in view of the object and purpose of the Covenant.

It is in the common interests of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Finland is further of the view that general reservations of the kind made by the Government of Kuwait, which do not clearly specify the extent of the derogation from the provisions of the Covenant, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Kuwait to the [said Covenant].

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Kuwait and Finland."

13 December 1999

With regard to the declarations to Articles 2, 3, 7, 8, 10 and 13 made by Bangladesh upon accession:

"The Government of Finland has examined the contents of the declarations made by the Government of Bangladesh to Articles 2, 3, 7, 8, 10 and 13 and notes that the declarations constitute reservations as they seem to modify the obligations of Bangladesh under the said articles.

A reservation which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define for the other Parties of the Convention the extent to which the reserving state commits itself to the Convention and therefore may raise doubts as to the commitment of the reserving state to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. Such a reservation is also, in the view of the Government of Finland, subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

Therefore the Government of Finland objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Bangladesh. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Bangladesh and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without Bangladesh benefitting from these reservations".

13 October 2004

With regard to the declarations and the reservation made by Turkey upon ratification:

"The Government of Finland has examined the declarations and reservation made by the Republic of Turkey to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The Government of Finland notes that the Republic of Turkey reserves the right to interpret and apply the provisions of the paragraphs 3 and 4 of Article 13 of the Covenant in accordance with the provisions under articles 3, 14 and 42 of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey.

The Government of Finland emphasises the great importance of the rights provided for in paragraphs 3 and 4 of Article 13 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The reference to certain proisions of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey is of a general nature and does not clearly specify the content of the reservation. The Government of Finland therefore wishes to declare that it assumes that the Government of the Republic of Turkey will ensure the implementation of the rights recognised in the Covenant and will do its utmost to bring its national legislation into compliance with the obligations under the Covenant with a view to withdrawing the reservation. This declaration does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Turkey and Finland."

15 November 2005

With regard to declaration made by Pakistan upon signature:

"The Government of Finland has carefully examined the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan regarding the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The Government of Finland takes note that the provisions of the Covenant shall, according to the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, be subject to the provisions of the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

The Government of Finland notes that a reservation which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying the contents does not clearly define to other Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Convention and creates serious doubts as to the commitment of the receiving State to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. Such reservations are, furthermore, subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the above-mentioned declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the Covenant. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and Finland. The Covenant will thus become operative between the two states without the Islamic Republic of Pakistan benefiting from its declaration."

FRANCE

The Government of the Republic takes objection to the reservation entered by the Government of India to article 1 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, as this reservation attaches conditions not provided for by the Charter of the United Nations to the exercise of the right of self-determination. The present declaration will not be deemed to be an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between the French Republic and the Republic of India.

30 September 1999

With regard to the declarations made by Bangladesh upon accession:

The Government of France notes that the 'declarations' made by Bangladesh in fact constitute reservations since they are aimed at precluding or modifying the legal effect of certain provisions of the treaty. With regard to the declaration concerning article 1, the reservation places on the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination conditions not provided for in the Charter of the United Nations. The declarations concerning articles 2 and 3 and articles 7 and 8, which render the rights recognized by the Covenant in respect of individuals subordinate to domestic law, are of a general nature and undermine the objective and purpose of the treaty. In particular, the country's economic conditions and development prospects should not affect the freedom of consent of intended spouses to enter into marriage, non-discrimination for reasons of parentage or other conditions in the implementation of special measures of protection and assistance on behalf of children and young persons, or the freedom of parents or legal guardians to choose schools for their children. Economic difficulties or problems of development cannot free a State party entirely from its obligations under the Covenant. In this regard, in compliance with article 10, paragraph 3, of the Covenant, Bangladesh must adopt special measures to protect children and young persons from economic and social expltation, and the law must punish their employment in work harmful to their morals or health and should also set age limits below which the paid employment of child labour should be prohibited. Consequently, the Government of France lodges an objection to the reservations of a general scope mentioned above. This objection does not prevent the entry into force of the Covenant between Bangladesh and France.

11 November 2005

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon signature:

The Government of the French Republic has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon signing the International

Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, adopted on 16 December 1966, according to which 'The provisions of the Covenant shall be subject to the provisions of the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan'. Such a declaration is general in scope and unclear and could render the provisions of the Covenant null and void. The Government of the French Republic considers that the said declaration constitutes a reservation which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and it therefore objects to that declaration. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between France and Pakistan.

GERMANY[9]

15 August 1980

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany strongly objects, ... to the declaration made by the Republic of India in respect of article 1 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and of article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

"The right of self-determination as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and as embodied in the Covenants applies to all peoples and not only to those under foreign domination. All peoples, therefore, have the inalienable right freely to determine their political status and freely to pursue their economic, social and cultural development. The Federal Government cannot consider as valid any interpretation of the right of self-determination which is contrary to the clear language of the provisions in question. It moreover considers that any limitation of their applicability to all nations is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenants."

10 July 1997

With regard to the declarations and the reservation made by Kuwait upon accession:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany notes that article 2 (2) and article 3 have been made subject to the general reservation of national law. It is of the view that these general reservations may raise doubts as to the commitment of Kuwait to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany regards the reservation concerning article 8 (1) (d), in which the Government of Kuwait reserves the right not to apply the right to strike expressly stated in the Covenant, as well as the interpretative declaration regarding article 9, according to which the right to social security would only apply to Kuwaitis, as being problematic in view of the object and purpose of the Covenant. It particularly feels that the declaration regarding article 9, as a result of which the many foreigners working on Kuwaiti territory would, on principle, be totally excluded from social security protection, cannot be based on article 2 (3) of the Covenant.

It is in the common interest of all parties that a treaty should be respected, as to its object and purpose, by all parties.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the [said] general reservations and interpretative declarations.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Kuwait and the Federal Republic of Germany."

13 October 2004

With regard to the declarations and the reservation made by Turkey upon ratification:

The Government of the Republic of Turkey has declared that it will implement the provisions of the Covenant only to the states with which it has diplomatic relations. Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Turkey has declared that it ratifies the Covenant exclusively with regard to the national territory where the Constitution and the legal and administrative order of the Republic of Turkey are applied. Furthermore, the Government of the Republic of Turkey has reserved the right to interpret and apply the provisions of Article 13 paragraphs (3) and (4) of the Covenant in accordance with the provisions of Articles 3, 14 and 42 of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany would like to recall that it is in the common interest of all states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected and applied as to their object and purpose by all parties, and that states are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is therefore concerned about declarations and reservations such as those made and expressed by the Republic of Turkey with respect to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

However, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany believes these declarations do not aim to limit the Covenant's scope in relation to those states with which Turkey has established bonds under the Covenant, and that they do not aim to impose any other restrictions that re not provided for by the Covenant. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany attaches great importance to the liberties recognized in Article 13 paragraphs (3) and (4) of the Covenant. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany understands the reservation expressed by the Government of the Republic of Turkey to mean that this Article will be interpreted and applied in such a way that protects the essence of the freedoms guaranteed therein.

8 November 2004

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon signature:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon signature of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan declared that it "will implement the (...) Provisions in a progressive manner, in keeping with the existing economic conditions and the development plans of the country". Since some fundamental obligations resulting from the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, including in particular the principle of non-discrimination found in Article 2 (2) thereof, are not susceptible to progressive implementation and are thus to be guaranteed immediately, the declaration represents a significant qualification of Pakistan's commitment to guarantee the human rights referred to in the Covenant.

The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan also declared that "the provisions of the Covenant shall, however, be subject to the provisions of the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan". The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that this leaves it unclear to which extent the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers itself bound by the obligations resulting from the Covenant.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore regards the above-mentioned declarations as reservations and as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan."

GREECE

11 October 2004

With regard to the declarations made by Turkey upon ratification:

"The Government of Greece has examined the declarations made by the Republic of Turkey upon ratifying the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The Republic of Turkey declares that it will implement the provisions of the Covenant only to the States with which it has diplomatic relations.

In the view of the Government of Greece, this declaration in fact amounts to a reservation. This reservation is incompatible with the principle that inter-State reciprocity has no place in the context of human rights treaties, which concern the endowment of individuals with rights. It is therefore contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Republic of Turkey furthermore declares that the Covenant is ratified exclusively with regard to the national territory where the Constitution and the legal and administrative order of the Republic of Turkey are applied.

In the view of the Government of Greece, this declaration in fact amounts to a reservation. This reservation is incompatible with the obligation of a State Party to respect and ensure the rights laid down in the Covenant to anyone within the power or effective control of that State Party, even if not situated within the territory of such State Party. Accordingly, this reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

For these reasons, the Government of Greece objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Republic of Turkey to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Hellenic Republic and the Republic of Turkey. The Covenant, therefore, enters into force between the two States without the Republic of Turkey benefiting from these reservations."

ITALY

25 July 1997

With regard to the declarations and the reservation made by Kuwait upon accession:

"The Government of Italy considers these reservations to be contrary to the object and the purpose of this International Covenant. The Government of Italy notes that the said reservations include a reservation of a general kind in respect of the provisions on the internal law.

The Government of Italy therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Kuwait to the [said Covenant].

This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Covenant between the State of Kuwait and the Italian Republic."

LATVIA

10 November 2005

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon signature:

"The Government of the Republic of Latvia has carefully examined the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Covenant on [Economic, Social and Cultural] Rights upon accession.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia considers that the declaration contains general reference to national law, making the provisions of International Covenant subject to the national law of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

Thus, the Government of the Republic of Latvia is of the opinion that the declaration is in fact a unilateral act deemed to limit the scope of application of the International Covenant and therefore, it shall be regarded as a reservation.

Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Latvia noted that the reservation does not make it clear to what extent the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers itself bound by the provisions of the International Covenant and whether the way of implementation of the provisions of the International Covenant is in line with the object and purpose of the International Covenant.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia recalls that customary international law as codified by Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, and in particular Article 19 (c), sets out the reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are not permissible.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the International Covenant between the Republic of Latvia and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Thus, the International Covenant will become operative without the Islamic Republic of Pakistan benefiting from its reservation."

NETHERLANDS

12 January 1981

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the declaration made by the Government of the Republic of India in relation to article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and article 1 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, since the right of self determination as embodied in the Covenants is conferred upon all peoples. This follows not only from the very language of article 1 common to the two Covenants but as well from the most authoritative statement of the law concerned, i.e., the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Any attempt to limit the scope of this right or to attach conditions not provided for in the relevant instruments would undermine the concept of self-determination itself and would thereby seriously weaken its universally acceptable character."

18 March 1991

With regard to the interpretative declaration made by Algeria concerning article 13, paragraphs 3 and 4 upon ratification:

"In the opinion of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the interpretative declaration concerning article 13, paragraphs 3 and 4 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights must be regarded as a reservation to the Covenant. From the text and history of the Covenant it follows that the reservation with respect to article 13, paragraphs 3 and 4 made by the Government of Algeria is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore considers the reservation unacceptable and formally raises an objection to it.

[This objection is] not an obstacle to the entry into force of [the Covenant] between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Algeria."

22 July 1997

With regard to the declarations and the reservati made by Kuwait upon accession:

[Same objection identical in essence, mutatis mutandis, as the one made for Algeria.]

23 April 2002

With regard to the statement made by China made upon ratification :

".....the statement made by the Government of the People's Republic of China to article 8.1 (a) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the statement and would like to recall that, under well established international treaty law, the name assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified, does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the statement made by the Government of the People's Republic of China to article 8.1 (a) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in substance constitutes a reservation.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands notes that the application of Article 8.1 (a) of the Covenant is being made subject to a statement referring to the contents of national legislation. According to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a party to a treaty may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to abide by the treaty. Furthermore, the right to form and join a trade union of one's choice is one of the fundamental principles of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the reservation made by the People's Republic of China to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and China."

7 October 2005

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon signature:

"The Government of the Kingdomof the Netherlands has examined the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan on 3 November 2004 upon signature of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, done at New York on 16 December 1966.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands would like to recall that the status of a statement is not determined by the designation assigned to it. The application of the provisions f the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights has been made subject to the provisions of the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

This makes it unclear to what extent the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers itself bound by the obligations of the treaty. It is of the common interest of States that all parties respect treaties to which they have chosen to become parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. A reservation as formulated by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan is thus likely to contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in substance constitutes a reservation.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, without Pakistan benefiting from its declaration."

NORWAY

22 July 1997

With regard to the declarations and the reservation made by Kuwait upon accession:

"In the view of the Government of Norway, a statement by which a State Party purports to limit its responsibilities by invoking general principles of internal law may create doubts about the commitment of the reserving State to the objective and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. Under well-established treaty law, a State is not permitted to invoke internal law as justification for its failure to perform its treaty obligations. Furthermore, the Government of Norway finds the reservations made to article 8, paragraph 1 (d) and article 9 as being problematic in view of the object and purpose of the Covenant. For these reasons, the Government of Norway objects to the said reservations made by the Government of Kuwait.

The Government of Norway does not consider this objection to preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of Norway and the State of Kuwait.

23 April 2002

With regard to the statement made by China made upon ratification:

"The Government of Norway has examined the statement made by the People's Republic of China upon ratification of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

It is the Government of Norway's position that the statement made by China in substance constitutes a reservation, and consequently can be made subject to objections.

According to the first paragraph of the statement, the application of Article 8.1(a) of the Covenant shall be consistent with relevant provisions of national legislation. This reference to national legislation, without further description of its contents, exempts the other States Parties from the possibility of assessing the intended effects of the statement. Further, the contents of the relevant provision is not only in itself of fundamental importance, as failure to implement it can also contribute to a less effective implementation of other provisions of the Covenant, such as Articles 6 and 7.

For these reasons, the Government of Norway objects to the said part of the statement made by the People's Republic of China, as it is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Covenant between the Kingdom of Norway and the People's Republic of China. The Covenant thus becomes operative between Norway and China without China benefiting from the reservation."

17 November 2005

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon signature:

"The Government of the Kingdom of Norway have examined the Declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan on 3 November 2004 on signature of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (New York, 16 December 1966). According to the first part of the Declaration, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan "will implement the (...) provisions (embodied in the Covenant) in a progressive manner, in keeping with the existing economic conditions and the development plans of the country". Since some fundamental obligations embodied in the Covenant, including in particular the principle of non-discrimination found in Article 2 (2) thereof, are not susceptible to progressive implementation and are thus to be guaranteed immediately, the Government of the Kingdom of Norway consider that this part of the Declaration represents a significant qualification of Pakistan's commitment to guarantee the provisions embodied in the Covenant.

According to the second part of the Declaration, "(t)he provisions of the Covenant shall, however, be subject to the provisions of the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. "The Goverment of the Kingdom of Norway note that a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Norway consider that both parts of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan's Declaration seek to limit the scope of the Covenant on a unilateral basis and therefore constitute reservations. The Government of the Kingdom of Norway consider both reservations to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant, and therefore object to the reservations made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Covenant between the Kingdom of Norway and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, without the Islamic Republic of Pakistan benefiting from its reservations."

PAKISTAN

"The Government of Islamic Republic of Pakistan objects to the declaration made by the Republic of India in respect of article 1 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The right of Self-determination as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and as embodied in the Covenants applies to all peoples under foreign occupation and alien domination.

The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan cannot consider as valid any interpretation of the right of self-determination which is contrary to the clear language of the provisions in question. Moreover, the said reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenants. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and India without India benefiting from its reservations."

PORTUGAL

26 October 1990

"The Government of Portugal hereby presents its formal objection to the interpretative declarations made by the Government of Algeria upon ratification of the International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights and on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The Government of Portugal having examined the contents of the said declarations reached the conclusion that they can be regarded as reservations and therefore should be considered invalid as well as incompatible with the purposes and object of the Covenants.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenants between Portugal and Algeria."

13 October 2004

With regard to the declarations and the reservation made by Turkey upon ratification:

"The Government of Portugal considers that reservations by which a State limits its responsibilities under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) by invoking certain provisions of national law in general terms may create doubts as to the commitment of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international law.

It is in the common interest of all States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Portugal therefore objects to the reservation by Turkey to the ICESCR. This objection shall not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Portugal and Turkey."

SPAIN

15 November 2005

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon signature:

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has examined the Declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan on 3 November 2004 on signature of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, of 16 December 1966.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain points out that regardless of what it may be called, a unilateral declaration made by a State for the purpose of excluding or changing the legal effects of certain provisions of a treaty as it applies to that State constitutes a reservation.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that the Declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, which seeks to subject the application of the provisions of the Covenant to the provisions of the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan is a reservation which seeks to limit the legal effects of the Covenant as it applies to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. A reservation that includes a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not make it possible to determine clearly the extent to which the Islamic Republic of Pakistan has accepted the obligations of the Covenant and, consequently, creates doubts as to the commitment of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that the Declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the effect that it subjects its obligations under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights to the provisions of its constitution is a reservation and that that reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

According to customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are not permissible.

Consequently, the Government of the Kingdom of Spain objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of Spain and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

SWEDEN

23 July 1997

With regard to the declarations and the reservation made by Kuwait upon accession:

"[The Government of Sweden] is of the view that these general reservations may raise doubts as to the commitment of Kuwait to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Sweden regards the reservation concerning article 8 (1) (d), in which the Government of Kuwait reserves the right not to apply the right to strike expressly stated in the Covenant, as well as the interpretative declaration regarding article 9, according to which the right to social security would only apply to Kuwaitis, as being problematic in view of the object and purpose of the Covenant. It particularly considers the declaration regarding article 9, as a result of which the many foreigners working on Kuwaiti territory would, in principle, be totally excluded from social security protection, cannot be based on article 2 (3) of the Covenant.

It is in the common interest of all parties that a treaty should be respected, as to its object and purpose, by all parties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the above-mentioned general reservations and interpretative declarations.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Kuwait and Sweden in its entirety."

14 December 1999

With regard to the declarations made by Bangladesh upon accession:

"In this context the Government of Sweden would like to recall, that under well-established international treaty law, the name assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified, does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. Thus, the Government of Sweden considers that the declarations made by the Government of Bangladesh, in the absence of further clarification, in substance constitute reservations to the Covenant.

The declaration concerning article 1 places on the exercise of the rig of peoples to self-determination conditions not provided for in international law. To attach such conditions could undermine the concept of self-determination itself and would thereby seriously weaken its universally acceptable character.

Furthermore, the Government of Sweden notes that the declaration relating to articles 2 and 3 as well as 7 and 8 respectively, imply that these articles of the Covenant are being made subject to a general reservation referring to relevant provisions of the domestic laws of Bangladesh.

Consequently, the Government of Sweden is of the view that, in the absence of further clarification, these declarations raise doubts as to the commitment of Bangladesh to the object and purpose of the Covenant and would recall that, according to well-established international law, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid general reservations made by the Government of Bangladesh to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Bangladesh and Sweden. The Covenant will thus become operative between the two States without Bangladesh benefiting from the declarations".

2 April 2002

With regard to the statement made by China upon ratification:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the statement and would like to recall that, under well-established international treaty law, the name assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified, does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. The Government of Sweden considers that the statement made by the Government of the People's Republic of China to article 8.1 (a) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in substance constitutes a reservation.

The Government of Sweden notes that the application of Article 8.1 (a) of the Covenant is being made subject to a statement referring to the contents of national legislation. According to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a party to a treaty may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to abide by the treaty. Furthermore, the right to form and join a trade union of one's choice is one of the fundamental principles of the Covenant. The Government of Sweden wishes to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the reservation made by the People's Republic of China to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between China and Sweden. The Covenant enters into force without China benefiting from the reservation."

30 June 2004

With regard to the declarations and reservation made by Turkey upon ratification:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the declarations and reservation made by the Republic of Turkey upon ratifying the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The Republic of Turkey declares that it will implement the provisions of the Covenant only to the State Parties with which it has diplomatic relations. This statement in fact amounts, in the view of the Government of Sweden, to a reservation. The reservation of the Republic of Turkey makes it unclear to what extent the Republic of Turkey considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant. In absence of further clarification, therefore, the reservation raises doubt as to the commitment of the Republic of Turkey to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Sweden notes that the interpretation and application of paragraphs 3 and 4 of article 13 of the Covenant is being made subject to a reservation referring to certain provisions of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey without specifying their contents. The Government of Sweden is of the view that in the absence of further clarification, this reservation, which does not clearly specify the extent of the Republic of Turkey's derogation from the provisions in question, raises serious doubts as to the commitment of the Republic of Turkey to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

According to established customary law as codified by the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of all States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Republic of Turkey to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Turkey and Sweden. The Covenant enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without the Republic of Turkey benefiting from its reservations."

1 March 2005

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon signature:

"The Government of Sweden would like to recall that the designation assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty.

The Government of Sweden is of the view that although Article 2 (1) of the Covenant allows for a progressive realization of the provisions, this may not be invoked as a basis for discrimination.

The application of the provisions of the Covenant has been made subject to provisions of the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. This makes it unclear to what extent the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers itself bound by the obligations of the treaty and therefore raises doubts as to the commitment of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the object and purpose of the Covenant. The Government of Sweden considers that the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in substance constitutes a reservation.

It is of common interest of States that all Parties respect treaties to which they have chosen to become parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the reservation made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Pakistan and Sweden, without Pakistan benefiting from its reservation."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

17 August 2005

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon signature:

"The Government of the United Kingdom have examined the Declaration made by the Government of Pakistan on 3 November 2004 on signature of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (done at New York on 16 December 1966).

The Government of the United Kingdom consider that the Government of Pakistan's Declaration which seeks to subject its obligations under the Covenant to the provisions of its own Constitution is a reservation which seeks to limit the scope of the Covenant on a unilateral basis. The Government of the United Kingdom note that a reservation to a Convention which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to this reservation made by the Government of Pakistan.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Pakistan."

Territorial Application

Participant	***Date of receipt of the notification***	***Territories***
Netherlands[12]	11 Dec 1978	Netherlands Antilles
Portugal[6]	27 Apr 1993	Macau
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[8,15]	20 May 1976	Belize, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and Dependencies, Gibraltar, Gilbert Islands, Guernsey, Hong Kong, Isle of Man, Bailiwick of Jersey, Montserrat, Pitcairn Island, St. Helena and Dependencies, Solomon Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands and Tuvalu

---

Notes:

[1] The thirty-fifth instrument of ratification or accession was deposited with the Secretary-General on 3 October 1975. The Contracting States did not object to having those instruments accompanied with reservations taken into account under article 27 (1) for the purpose of determining the date of general entry into force of the Covenant.

[2] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention with reservations on 27 March 1973 and 8 November 1973, respectively. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 993. p. 83. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convenant on 8 August 1967 and 2 June 1971, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] The signature was effected by Democratic Kampuchea. In this regard the Secretary-General received, on 5 November

1980, the following communication from the Government of Mongolia:

"The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that only the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea as the sole authentic and lawful representative of the Kampuchean people has the right to assume international obligations on behalf of the Kampuchean people. Therefore the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that the signature of the Human Rights Covenants by the representative of the so-called Democratic Kampuchea, a régime that ceased to exist as a result of the people's revolution in Kampuchea, is null and void.

"The signing of the Human Rights Covenants by an individual, whose régime during its short period of reign in Kampuchea had exterminated about 3 million people and had thus grossly violated the elementary norms of human rights, each and every provision of the Human Rights Covenants is a regrettable precedence, which discredits the noble aims and lofty principles of the United Nations Charter, the very spirit of the above-mentioned Covenants, gravely impairs the prestige of the United Nations."

Thereafter, similar communications were received from the Government of the following States on the dates indicated and their texts were circulated as depositary notifications or, at the request of the States concerned, as official documents of the General Assembly (A/33/781 and A/35/784):

Participant:	***Date of receipt:***		
German Democratic Republic	11	Dec	1980
Poland	12	Dec	1980
Ukraine	16	Dec	1980
Hungary	19	Jan	1981
Bulgaria	29	Jan	1981
Belarus	18	Feb	1981
Russian Federation	18	Feb	1981
Czechoslovakia	10	Mar	1981

---

[5] Although Democratic Kampuchea had signed both [the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights] on 17 October 1980 (see note 3 in this chapter), the Government of Cambodia deposited an instrument of accession to the said Covenants.

[6] In its notification of territorial application to Macau, the Government of Portugal stated the following:

... The Covenants are confirmed and proclaimed binding and valid, and they shall have effect and be implemented and observed without exception, bearing in mind that:

Article 1. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, ratified, respectively, by Act No. 29/78 of 12 June, and by Act No. 45/78 of 11 July, shall be applicable in the territory of Macau.

Article 2 . 1. The applicability in Macau of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and in particular of article 1 in both Covenants, shall in no way effect the status of Macau as defined in the Constitution of the Portuguese Republic and in the Organic Statute of Macau.

2. The applicability of the Covenants in Macau shall in no way affect the provisions of the Joint Declaration of the Government of the Portuguese Republic and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Macau, signed on 13 April 1987, especially with respect to the provision specifying that Macau forms part of Chinese territory and that the Government of the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau with effect from 20 December 1999, and that Portugal will be responsible for the administration until 19 December 1999.

Article 3. Article 25 (b) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights shall not apply to Macau with respect to the composition of elected bodies and the method of choosing and electing their officials as defined in the Constitution of the Portuguese Republic, the Organic Statute of Macau and provisions of the Joint Declaration on the Question of Macau.

Article 4. Article 12 (4) and article 13 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights shall not apply to Macau with respect to the entry and exit of individuals and the expulsion of foreigners from the territory. These matters shall continue to be regulated by the Organic Statute of Macau and other applicable legislation, and also by the Joint Declaration on the Question of Macau.

Article 5. 1. The provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights that are applicable to Macau shall be implemented in Macau, in particular through specific legal documents issued by the organs of government of the territory.

Subsequently, on 21 October and 3 December 1999, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Macao from Portugal and China (see note 3 under “China” and note 1 under “Portugal” regarding Macao in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Covenant with reservation made by China will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region as well as with the following declaration:

1. The application of the Covenant, and its article 1 in particular, to the Macao Special Administrative Region shall not affect the status of Macao as defined in the Joint Declaration and in the Basic Law.

2. The provisions of the Covenant which are applicable to the Macao Special Administrative Region shall be implemented in Macao through legislation of the Macao Special Administrative Region.

The residents of Macao shall not be restricted in the rights and freedoms that they are entitled to, unless otherwise provided for by law. In case of restrictions, they shall not contravene the provisions of the Covenant that are applicable to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

Within the above ambit, the Government of the People's Republic of China will assume the responsibility for the international righttions that place on a Party to the Covenant.

[7] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 5 October 1967. See note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

With reference to the above-mentioned signature, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Representatives of Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia, stating that their Governments did not recognize the said signature as valid since the only Government authorized to represent China and to assume obligations on its behalf was the Government of the People's Republic of China.

In letters addressed to the Secretary-General in regard to the above-mentioned communications, the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations stated that the Republic of China, a sovereign State and Member of the United Nations, had attended the twenty-first regular session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and contributed to the formulation of, and signed the Covenants and the Optional Protocol concerned, and that "any statements or reservations relating to the above-mentioned Covenants and Optional Protocol that are incompatible with or derogatory to the legitimate position of the Government of the Republic of China shall in no way affect the rights and obligations of the Republic of China under these Covenants and Optional Protocol".

[8] With regard to the application of the Covenant to Hong Kong, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom (see note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" concering Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Covenant with the reservation made by China will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

Further, on 20 April 2001, the Secretary-General received from the Government of China the following communication:

1. Article 6 of the Covenant does not preclude the formulation of regulations by the HKSAR for employment restrictions, based on place of birth or residence qualifications, for the purpose of safeguarding the employment opportunities of local workers in the HKSAR

2. "National federations or confederations" in Article 8.1(b) of the Covenant shall be interpreted, in this case, as "federations or confederations in the HKSAR", and this Article does not imply the right of trade union federations or confederations to form or join political organizations or bodies established outside the HKSAR.

[9] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Covenant on 7 October 1968 and 23 December 1975, respectively, with declarations. For the text of the declarations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 993, pp.78 and 85. See also note 3 in this chapter and note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[11] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[12] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[13] See note 1 "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau under in the "Historical Information" section in the preliminary pages in the front matter of this volume.

[14] In a communication received on 10 May 1982, the Government of Solomon Islands declared that Solomon Islands maintains the reservations entered by the United Kingdom save in so far as the same cannot apply to Solomon Islands.

[15] On 3 October 1983 the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following objection:

[The Government of Argentina makes a] formal objection to the [declaration] of territorial extension issued by the United Kingdom with regard to the Malvinas Islands (and dependencies), which that country is illegally occupying and refers to as the "Falkland Islands".

The Argentine Republic rejects and considers null and void the [said declaration] of territorial extension.

With reference to the above-mentioned objection the Secretary-General received, on 28 February 1985, from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following declaration:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to their right, by notification to the Depositary under the relevant provisions of the above-mentioned Convention, to extend the application of the Convention in question to the Falkland Islands or to the Falkland Islands Dependencies, as the case may be.

For this reason alone, the Government of the United Kingdom are unable to regard the Argentine [communication] under reference as having any legal effect."

Upon ratification, the Government of Argentina made the following declaration with regard to the above-mentioned declaration made by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

The Argentine Republic rejects the extension, notified to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 20 May 1976 by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, of the application of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 16 December 1966, to the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands, and reaffirms its sovereign rights to those archipelagos, which form an integral part of its national territory.

The General Assembly of the United Nations had adopted resol- utions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII),1/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6 and 40/21 in which it recognizes the existence of a sovereignty dispute regarding the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and urges the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to pursue negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful and definitive solution to the dispute, through the good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall inform the General Assembly of the progress made."

With reference to the above-mentioned declaration by the Govern- ment of Argentina, the Secretary-General received, on 13 January 1988, from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following communication:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland rejects the statements made by the Argentine Republic, regarding the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, when ratifying [the said Covenants and acceding to the said Protocol].

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland has no doubt as to British sovereignty over the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and its consequent right to extend treaties to those territories."

[16] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[17] With respect to the interpretative declarations made by Algeria the Secretary-General received, on 25 October 1990, from the Government of Germany the following declaration:

[The Federal Republic of Germany] interprets the declaration under paragraph 2 to mean that the latter is not intended to eliminate the obligation of Algeria to ensure that the rights guaranteed in article 8, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and in article 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights may be restricted only for the reasons mentioned in the said articles and that such restrictions shall be prescribed by law.

It interprets the declaration under paragraph 4 to mean that Algeria, by referring to its domestic legal system, does not intend to restrict its obligation to ensure through appropriate steps equality of rights and responsibilities of spouses as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution.

[18] In this regard, the Secretary-General received communications from the following Governments on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Germany (17 December 1999):

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany notes that the declaration concerning article 1 constitutes a reservation that places on the exercise of the right of all peoples to self-determination conditions not provided for in international law. To attach such conditions could undermine the concept of self-determination and seriously weaken its universally acceptable character.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany further notes that the declarations with regard to articles 2 and 3, 7 and 8, and 10 and 13 constitute reservations of a general nature in respect of provisions of the Covenant which may be contrary to the Constitution, legislation, economic conditions and development plans of Bangladesh.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the view that these general reservations raise doubts as to the full commitment of Bangladesh to the object and purpose of the Covenant. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become Parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all Parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Federal Republic of Germany and the People's Republic of Bangladesh".

Netherlands (20 December 1999):

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the declarations made by the Government of Bangladesh at the time of its accession to the International Covenant on economic, social and ctural rights and considers the declarations concerning Articles 1, 2 and 3, and 7 and 8 as reservations.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservation made by the Government of Bangladesh in relation to Article 1 of the said Covenant, since the right of self-determination as embodied in the Covenant is conferred upon all peoples. This follows not only from the very language of Article 1 of the Covenant but as well from the most authoritative statement of the law concerned, i.e. the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Any attempt to limit the scope of this right or to attach conditions not provided for in the relevant instruments would undermine the concept of self-determination itself and would thereby seriously weaken its universally acceptable character.

Furthermore, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations made by the Government of Bangladesh in relation to Articles 2 and 3, and, 7 and 8 of the said Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that such reservations which seek to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Covenant by invoking national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of this State to the object and purpose of the Covenant and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties should be respected, as to object and purpose by all parties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Bangladesh.

These objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Bangladesh".

[19] On 30 September 1992, the Government of Belarus notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 993, p. 78.

[20] On 21 March 2001, the Government of the Congo informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation made upon accession which read as follows:

Reservation:

The Government of the People's Republic of the Congo declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraphs 3 and 4 ...

Paragraphs 3 and 4 of article 13 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights embody the principle of freedom of education by allowing parents the liberty to choose for their children schools other than those established by the public authorities. Those provisions also authorize individuals to establish and direct educational institutions.

In our country, such provisions are inconsistent with the principle of nationalization of education and with the monopoly granted to the State in that area.

[21] In a communication received on 14 January 1976, the Government of Denmark notified the Secretary-General that it withdraws its reservation made prior with regard to article 7 (a) (i) on equal pay for equal work.

[22] In two communications received by the Secretary-General on 10 July 1969 and 23 March 1971 respectively, the Government of Israel declared that it "has noted the political character of the declaration made by the Government of Iraq on signing and ratifying the above Covenants. In the view of the Government of Israel, these two Covenants are not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Iraq an attitude of complete reciprocity.

Identical communications, *mutatis mutandis* , were received by the Secretary-General from the Government of Israel on 9 July 1969 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by the Government of Syria, and on 29 June 1970 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by the Government of Libya. In the latter communication, the Government of Israel moreover stated that the declaration concerned "cannot in any way affect the obligations of the Libyan Arab Republic already existing under general international law".

[23] Upon ratification, the Government of Malta indicated that it had decided to withdraw its reservation made upon signature to paragraph 2, article 10. For the text of the said reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 993, p. 80.

[24] On 5 September 2003, the Government of New Zealand informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the following reservation in respect only of the metropolitan territory of New Zealand. The reservation reads as follows:

"The Government of New Zealand reserves the right to postpone, in the economic circumstances foreseeable at the present time, the implementation of article 10 (2) as it relates to paid maternity leave or leave with adequate social security benefits."

Moreover, the Government of New Zealand notified the Secretary-General of the the following territorial exclusion:

"Declares that, consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand to the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, the withdrawal of this reservation shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory."

See also note 1 under "Cook Islands" and note 1 under "Niue" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[25] With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon signature, the Secetary-General received a communication from the following State on the date indicated hereinafter:

Austria (25 November 2005):

"The Government of Austria has examined the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon signature of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The application of the provisions of the Covenant has been made subject to provisions of national law. This makes it unclear to what extent the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers itself bound by the obligations of the treaty and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Austria considers that the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the Covenant in substance constitutes a reservation and that this reservation is incompatible with the object and the purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Austria therefore objects to the reservation made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the Covenant.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and the Republic of Austria."

[26] On 17 April 2008, the Government of Pakistan informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the declaration made upon signature. The declaration reads as follows:

"While the Government of Islamic Republic of Pakistan accepts the provisions embodied in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, it will implement the said provisions in a progressive manner, in keeping with the existing economic conditions and the development plans of the country. The provisions of the Covenant shall, however, be subject to the provisions of the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan."

[27] On 15 December 2008, the Government of Rwanda informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession. The reservation reads as follows:

The Rwandese Republic [is] bound, however, in respect of education, only by the provisions of its Constitution.

3. a) Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

New York, 10 December 2008

Note: The above Optional Protocol was adopted on 10 December 2008 during the sixty-third session of the General Assembly by resolution A/RES/63/117. In accordance with article 17, the Optional Protocol shall be open for signature by any State that has signed, ratified or acceded to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The signing ceremony will be held on 24 September 2009 during the 2009 Treaty Event at the United Nations Headquarters in New York.

4. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

New York, 16 December 1966

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 23 March 1976, in accordance with article 49, for all provisions except those of article 41; 28 March 1979 for the provisions of article 41 (Human Rights Committee), in accordance with paragraph 2 of the said article 41.

REGISTRATION: 23 March 1976, No. 14668.

STATUS: Signatories: 72. Parties: 164.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 999, p. 171 and vol. 1057, p. 407 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic Spanish text); depositary notification C.N.782.2001.TREATIES-6 of 5 October 2001 [Proposal of correction to the original of the Covenant (Chinese authentic text)] and C.N.8.2002.TREATEIS-1 of 3 January 2002 [Rectification of the original of the Covenant (Chinese authentic text)].

Note: The Covenant was opened for signature at New York on 19 December 1966.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Afghanistan		24 Jan 1983 a
Albania		4 Oct 1991 a
Algeria	10 Dec 1968	12 Sep 1989
Andorra	5 Aug 2002	22 Sep 2006
Angola		10 Jan 1992 a
Argentina	19 Feb 1968	8 Aug 1986
Armenia		23 Jun 1993 a
Australia	18 Dec 1972	13 Aug 1980
Austria	10 Dec 1973	10 Sep 1978
Azerbaijan		13 Aug 1992 a
Bahamas	4 Dec 2008	23 Dec 2008
Bahrain		20 Sep 2006 a
Bangladesh		6 Sep 2000 a
Barbados		5 Jan 1973 a
Belarus	19 Mar 1968	12 Nov 1973
Belgium	10 Dec 1968	21 Apr 1983
Belize		10 Jun 1996 a
Benin		12 Mar 1992 a
Bolivia		12 Aug 1982 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1]		1 Sep 1993 d
Botswana	8 Sep 2000	8 Sep 2000
Brazil		24 Jan 1992 a
Bulgaria	8 Oct 1968	21 Sep 1970
Burkina Faso		4 Jan 1999 a
Burundi		9 May 1990 a
Cambodia[2,3]	17 Oct 1980	26 May 1992 a
Cameroon		27 Jun 1984 a
Canada		19 May 1976 a
Cape Verde		6 Aug 1993 a
Central African Republic		8 May 1981 a
Chad		9 Jun 1995 a
Chile	16 Sep 1969	10 Feb 1972
China[4,5,6]	5 Oct 1998	
Colombia	21 Dec 1966	29 Oct 1969
Comoros	25 Sep 2008	
Congo		5 Oct 1983 a
Costa Rica	19 Dec 1966	29 Nov 1968
Côte d'Ivoire		26 Mar 1992 a
Croatia[1]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba	28 Feb 2008	
Cyprus	19 Dec 1966	2 Apr 1969
Czech Republic[7]		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic People's Republic of Korea[8]		14 Sep 1981 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo		1 Nov 1976 a
Denmark	20 Mar 1968	6 Jan 1972
Djibouti		5 Nov 2002 a
Dominica		17 Jun 1993 a
Dominican Republic		4 Jan 1978 a
Ecuador	4 Apr 1968	6 Mar 1969
Egypt	4 Aug 1967	14 Jan 1982
El Salvador	21 Sep 1967	30 Nov 1979
Equatorial Guinea		25 Sep 1987 a
Eritrea		22 Jan 2002 a
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Ethiopia		11 Jun 1993 a
Finland	11 Oct 1967	19 Aug 1975
France		4 Nov 1980 a
Gabon		21 Jan 1983 a
Gambia		22 Mar 1979 a
Georgia		3 May 1994 a

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Germany[9,10]	9 Oct 1968	17 Dec 1973
Ghana	7 Sep 2000	7 Sep 2000
Greece		5 May 1997 a
Grenada		6 Sep 1991 a
Guatemala		5 May 1992 a
Guinea	28 Feb 1967	24 Jan 1978
Guinea-Bissau	12 Sep 2000	
Guyana	22 Aug 1968	15 Feb 1977
Haiti		6 Feb 1991 a
Honduras	19 Dec 1966	25 Aug 1997
Hungary	25 Mar 1969	17 Jan 1974
Iceland	30 Dec 1968	22 Aug 1979
India		10 Apr 1979 a
Indonesia		23 Feb 2006 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	4 Apr 1968	24 Jun 1975
Iraq	18 Feb 1969	25 Jan 1971
Ireland	1 Oct 1973	8 Dec 1989
Israel	19 Dec 1966	3 Oct 1991
Italy	18 Jan 1967	15 Sep 1978
Jamaica	19 Dec 1966	3 Oct 1975
Japan	30 May 1978	21 Jun 1979
Jordan	30 Jun 1972	28 May 1975
Kazakhstan	2 Dec 2003	24 Jan 2006
Kenya		1 May 1972 a
Kuwait		21 May 1996 a
Kyrgyzstan		7 Oct 1994 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic	7 Dec 2000	
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 a
Lebanon		3 Nov 1972 a
Lesotho		9 Sep 1992 a
Liberia	18 Apr 1967	22 Sep 2004
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		15 May 1970 a
Liechtenstein		10 Dec 1998 a
Lithuania		20 Nov 1991 a
Luxembourg	26 Nov 1974	18 Aug 1983
Madagascar	17 Sep 1969	21 Jun 1971
Malawi		22 Dec 1993 a
Maldives		19 Sep 2006 a
Mali		16 Jul 1974 a
Malta		13 Sep 1990 a
Mauritania		17 Nov 2004 a
Mauritius		12 Dec 1973 a
Mexico		23 Mar 1981 a
Monaco	26 Jun 1997	28 Aug 1997
Mongolia	5 Jun 1968	18 Nov 1974
Montenegro[11]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	19 Jan 1977	3 May 1979
Mozambique		21 Jul 1993 a
Namibia		28 Nov 1994 a
Nauru	12 Nov 2001	
Nepal		14 May 1991 a
Netherlands	25 Jun 1969	11 Dec 1978
New Zealand[12]	12 Nov 1968	28 Dec 1978
Nicaragua		12 Mar 1980 a
Niger		7 Mar 1986 a
Nigeria		29 Jul 1993 a
Norway	20 Mar 1968	13 Sep 1972
Pakistan	17 Apr 2008	
Panama	27 Jul 1976	8 Mar 1977
Papua New Guinea		21 Jul 2008 a
Paraguay		10 Jun 1992 a
Peru	11 Aug 1977	28 Apr 1978
Philippines	19 Dec 1966	23 Oct 1986
Poland	2 Mar 1967	18 Mar 1977
Portugal[4]	7 Oct 1976	15 Jun 1978
Republic of Korea		10 Apr 1990 a
Republic of Moldova		26 Jan 1993 a
Romania	27 Jun 1968	9 Dec 1974
Russian Federation	18 Mar 1968	16 Oct 1973
Rwanda		16 Apr 1975 a
Samoa		15 Feb 2008 a
San Marino		18 Oct 1985 a
Sao Tome and Principe	31 Oct 1995	
Senegal	6 Jul 1970	13 Feb 1978
Serbia[1]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		5 May 1992 a
Sierra Leone		23 Aug 1996 a
Slovakia[7]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[1]		6 Jul 1992 d
Somalia		24 Jan 1990 a
South Africa	3 Oct 1994	10 Dec 1998
Spain	28 Sep 1976	27 Apr 1977
Sri Lanka		11 Jun 1980 a
St. Vincent and the Grenadines		9 Nov 1981 a

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Sudan		18 Mar 1986 a
Suriname		28 Dec 1976 a
Swaziland		26 Mar 2004 a
Sweden	29 Sep 1967	6 Dec 1971
Switzerland		18 Jun 1992 a
Syrian Arab Republic		21 Apr 1969 a
Tajikistan		4 Jan 1999 a
Thailand		29 Oct 1996 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1]		18 Jan 1994 d
Timor-Leste		18 Sep 2003 a
Togo		24 May 1984 a
Trinidad and Tobago		21 Dec 1978 a
Tunisia	30 Apr 1968	18 Mar 1969
Turkey	15 Aug 2000	23 Sep 2003
Turkmenistan		1 May 1997 a
Uganda		21 Jun 1995 a
Ukraine	20 Mar 1968	12 Nov 1973
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[6]	16 Sep 1968	20 May 1976
United Republic of Tanzania		11 Jun 1976 a
United States of America	5 Oct 1977	8 Jun 1992
Uruguay	21 Feb 1967	1 Apr 1970
Uzbekistan		28 Sep 1995 a
Vanuatu	29 Nov 2007	21 Nov 2008
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	24 Jun 1969	10 May 1978
Viet Nam		24 Sep 1982 a
Yemen		9 Feb 1987 a
Zambia		10 Apr 1984 a
Zimbabwe		13 May 1991 a

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.
For objections thereto and declarations recognizing the competence of the Human Rights Committee under article 41, see hereinafter.)

AFGHANISTAN

[See chapter IV.3.]

ALGERIA[13]

[See chapter IV.3.]

ARGENTINA

Understanding:

The Argentine Government states that the application of the second part of article 15 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights shall be subject to the principle laid down in article 18 of the Argentine National Constitution.

AUSTRALIA[14]

Reservations:

Article 10

"In relation to paragraph 2 (a) the principle of segregation is accepted as an objective to be achieved progressively. In relation to paragraph 2 (b) and 3 (second sentence) the obligation to segregate is accepted only to the extent that such segregation is considered by the responsible authorities to be beneficial to the juveniles or adults concerned".

Article 14

"Australia makes the reservation that the provision of compensation for miscarriage of justice in the circumstances contemplated in paragraph 6 of article 14 may be by administrative procedures rather than pursuant to specific legal provision."

Article 20

"Australia interprets the rights provided for by articles 19, 21 and 22 as consistent with article 20; accordingly, the Common wealth and the constituent States, having legislated with respect to the subject matter of the article in matters of practical concern in the interest of public order (*ordre public*), the right is reserved not to introduce any further legislative provision on these matters."

Declaration:

"Australia has a federal constitutional system in which legislative, executive and judicial powers are shared or distributed between the Commonwealth and the constituent States. The implementation of the treaty throughout Australia will be effected by the Commonwealth, State and Territory authorities having regard to their respective constitutional powers and arrangements concerning their exercise."

AUSTRIA

1. Article 12, paragraph 4, of the Covenant will be applied provided that it will not affect the Act of April 3, 1919, State Law Gazette No. 209, concerning the Expulsion and the Transfer of Property of the House of

Habsburg-Lorraine as amended by the Act of October 30, 1919, State Law Gazette No. 501, the Federal Constitutional Act of July 30, 1925, Federal Law Gazette No. 292, and the Federal Constitutional Act of January 26, 1928, Federal Law Gazette No. 30, read in conjunction with the Federal Constitutional Act of July 4, 1963, Federal Law Gazette No. 172.

2. Article 9 and article 14 of the Covenant will be applied provided that legal regulations governing the proceedings and measures of deprivation of liberty as provided for in the Administrative Procedure Acts and in the Financial Penal Act remain permissible within the framework of the judicial review by the Federal Administrative Court or the Federal Constitutional Court as provided by the Austrian Federal Constitution.

3. Article 10, paragraph 3, of the Covenant will be applied provided that legal regulations allowing for juvenile prisoners to be detained together with adults under 25 years of age who give no reason for concern as to their possible detrimental influence on the juvenile prisoner remain permissible.

4. Article 14 of the Covenant will be applied provided that the principles governing the publicity of trials as set forth in article 90 of the Federal Constitutional Law as amended in 1929 are in no way prejudiced and that

(a) paragraph 3, sub-paragraph (d) is not in conflict with legal regulations which stipulate that an accused person who disturbs the orderly conduct of the trial or whose presence would impede the questioning of another accused person, of a witness or of an expert can be excluded from participation in the trial;

(b) paragraph 5 is not in conflict with legal regulations which stipulate that after an acquittal or a lighter sentence passed by a court of the first instance, a higher tribunal may pronounce conviction or a heavier sentence for the same offence, while they exclude the convicted person's right to have such conviction or heavier sentence reviewed by a still higher tribunal;

(c) paragraph 7 is not in conflict with legal regulations which allow proceedings that led up to a person's final conviction or acquittal to be reopened.

5. Articles 19, 21 and 22 in connection with article 2 (1) of the Covenant will be applied provided that they are not in conflict with legal restrictions as provided for in article 16 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

6. Article 26 is understood to mean that it does not exclude different treatment of Austrian nationals and aliens, as is also permissible under article 1, paragraph 2, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

BAHAMAS

Reservation

"The Government of The Bahamas recognizes and accepts the principle of compensation for wrongful imprisonment contained in paragraph 6 of article 14, but the problems of implementation are such that the right not to apply that principle is presently reserved."

BAHRAIN[15]

Reservation :

"1. The Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain interprets the Provisions of Article 3, (18) and (23) as not affecting in any way the prescriptions of the Islamic Shariah.

2. The Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain interprets the provisions of Article (9), Paragraph (5) as not detracting from its right to layout the basis and rules of obtaining the compensation mentioned in this Paragraph.

3. The Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain interprets Article (14) Paragraph (7) as no obligation arise from it further those set out in Article (10) of the Criminal Law of Bahrain which provides:

'Legal Proceedings cannot be instated against a person who has been acquitted by Foreign Courts from offenses of which he is accused or a final judgement has been delivered against him and the said person fulfilled the punishment or the punishment has been abolished by prescription.' "

BANGLADESH

Declarations:

"Article 10:

So far as the first part of paragraph 3 of Article 10 relating to reformation and social rehabilitation of prisoners is concerned, Bangladesh does not have any facility to this effect on account of financial constraints and for lack of proper logistics support. The last part of this paragraph relating to segregation of juvenile offenders from adults is a legal obligation under Bangladesh law and is followed accordingly.

Article 11:

Article 11 providing that "no one shall be imprisoned merely on the ground of inability to fulfil a contractual obligation," is generally in conformity with the Constitutional and legal provisions in Bangladesh, except in some very exceptional circumstances, where the law provides for civil imprisonment in case of willful default in complying with a decree. The Government of People's Republic of Bangladesh will apply this article in accordance with its existing municipal law.

Article 14:

So far as the provision of legal assistance in paragraph 3(d) of Article 14 is concerned, a person charged with criminal offences is statutorily entitled to legal assistance if he does not have the means to procure such assistance.

The Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, notwithstanding its acceptance of the principle of compensation for miscarriage of justice, as stipulated in Article 14, paragraph 6, is not in a position to guarantee a comprehensive implementation of this provision for the time being. However, the aggrieved has the right to realise compensation for miscarriage of justice by separate proceedings and in some cases, the court ***suo moto*** grants compensation to victims of miscarriage of justice. Bangladesh, however, intends to ensure full implementation of this provision in the near future."

Reservation:

Article 14

"The Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh reserveapply paragraph 3 (d) of Article 14 in view of the fact, that, while the existing laws of Bangladesh provide that, in the ordinary course a person, shall be entitled to be tried in his presence, it also provides for a trial to be held in his absence if he is a fugitive offender, or is a person, who being required to appear before a court, fails to present himself or to explain the reasons for non-appearance to the satisfaction of the court."

BARBADOS

"The Government of Barbados states that it reserves the right not to apply in full, the guarantee of free legal assistance in accordance with paragraph 3 (d) of Article 14 of the Covenant, since, while accepting the principles contained in the same paragraph, the problems of implementation are such that full application cannot be guaranteed at present."

BELARUS[16]

BELGIUM[17]

Reservations:

...

2. The Belgian Government considers that the provision of article 10, paragraph 2 (a), under which accused persons shall, save in exceptional circumstances, be segregated from convicted persons is to be interpreted in conformity with the principle, already embodied in the standard minimum rules for the treatment of prisoners [resolution (73) 5 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe of 19 January 1973], that untried prisoners shall not be put in contact with convicted prisoners against their will [rules 7 (b) and 85 (1)]. If they so request, accused persons may be allowed to take part with convicted persons in certain communal activities.

3. The Belgian Government considers that the provisions of article 10, paragraph 3, under which juvenile offenders shall be segregated from adults and be accorded treatment appropriate to their age and legal status refers exclusively to the judicial measures provided for under the *régime* for the protection of minors established by the Belgian Act relating to the protection of young persons. As regards other juvenile ordinary-law of- fenders, the Belgian Government intends to reserve the option to adopt measures that may be more flexible and be designed precisely in the interest of the persons concerned.

4. With respect to article 14, the Belgian Government considers that the last part of paragraph 1 of the article appears to give States the option of providing or not providing for certain derogations from the principle that judgements shall be made public. Accordingly, the Belgian constitutional principle that there shall be no exceptions to the public pronouncements of judgements is in conformity with that provision. Paragraph 5 of the article shall not apply to persons who, under Belgian law, are convicted and sentenced at second instance following an appeal against their acquittal of first instance or who, under Belgian law, are brought directly before a higher tribunal sch as the Court of Cassation, the Appeals Court or the Assize Court.

5. Articles 19, 21 and 22 shall be applied by the Belgian Government in the context of the provisions and restrictions set forth or authorized in articles 10 and 11 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 4 November 1950, by the said Convention.

Declarations:

6. The Belgian Government declares that it does not consider itself obligated to enact legislation in the field covered by article 20, paragraph 1, and that article 20 as a whole shall be applied taking into account the rights to freedom of thought and religion, freedom of opinion and freedom of assembly and association proclaimed in articles 18, 19 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and reaffirmed in articles 18, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant.

7. The Belgian Government declares that it interprets article 23, paragraph 2, as meaning that the right of persons of marriageable age to marry and to found a family presupposes not only that national law shall prescribe the marriageable age but that it may also regulate the exercise of that right.

BELIZE

Reservations:

"(a) The Government of Belize reserves the right not to apply paragraph 2 of article 12 in view of the statutory provisions requiring persons intending to travel abroad to furnish tax clearance certificates;

(b) The Government of Belize reserves the right not to apply in full the guarantee of free legal assistance in accordance with paragraph 3 (d) of article 14, since, while it accepts the principle contained in that paragraph and at present applies it in certain defined cases, the problems of implementation are such that full application cannot be guaranteed at present;

(c) The Government of Belize recognizes and accepts the principle of compensation for wrongful imprisonment contained in paragraph 6 of article 14, but the problems of implementation are such that the right not to apply that principle is presently reserved."

BOTSWANA[18]

Reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The Government of the Republic of Botswana considers itself bound by:

a) Article 7 of the Covenant to the extent that "torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment" means torture inhuman or degrading punishment or other treatment prohibited by Section 7 of the Constitution of the Republic of Botswana.

b) Article 12 paragraph 3 of the Covenant to the extent that the provisions are compatible with Section 14 of the Constitution of the Republic of Botswana relating to the imposition of restrictions reasonably required in certain exceptional instances."

BULGARIA

[See chapter IV.3]

CHINA

Statement:

The signature that the Taiwain authorities affixed, by usurping the name of "China", to the [Convention] on 5 October 1967, is illegal and null and void.

CONGO

Reservation:

The Government of the People's Republic of Congo declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 11 [...]

Article 11 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is quite incompatible with articles 386 *et seq* . of the Congolese Code of Civil, Commercial, Administrative and Financial Procedure, derived from Act 51/83 of 21 April 1983. Under those provisions, in matters of private law, decisions or orders emanating from conciliation proceedings may be enforced through imprisonment for debt when other means of enforcement have failed, when the amount due exceeds 20,000 CFA francs and when the debtor, between 18 and 60 years of age, makes himself insolvent in bad faith.

CUBA

Declaration:

The Republic of Cuba hereby declares that it was the Revolution that enabled its people to enjoy the rights set out in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America and its policy of hostility and aggression against Cuba constitute the most serious obstacle to the Cuban people's enjoyment of the rights set out in the Covenant.

The rights protected under this Covenant are enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic and in national legislation.

The State's policies and programmes guarantee the effective exercise and protection of these rights for all Cubans.

With respect to the scope and implementation of some of the provisions of this international instrument, Cuba will make such reservations or interpretative declarations as it may deem appropriate.

Czech Republic[7]

Denmark

"1. The Government of Denmark makes a reservation in respect of Article 10, paragraph 3, second sentence. In Danish practice, considerable efforts are made to ensure appropriate age distribution of convicts serving sentences of imprisonment, but it is considered valuable to maintain possibilities of flexible arrangements.

"2. (a). Article 14, paragraph 1, shall not be binding on Denmark in respect of public hearings. In Danish law, the right to exclude the press and the public from trials may go beyond what is permissible under this Covenant, and the Government of Denmark finds that this right should not be restricted.

(b). Article 14, paragraphs 5 and 7, shall not be binding on Denmark.

The Danish Administration of Justice Act contains detailed provisions regulating the matters dealt with in these two paragraphs. In some cases, Danish legislation is less restrictive than the Covenant (e.g. a verdict returned by a jury on the question of guilt cannot be reviewed by a higher tribunal, cf. paragraph 5); in other cases, Danish legislation is more restrictive than the Coven ant (e.g. with respect to resumption of a criminal case in which the accused party was acquitted, cf. paragraph 7).

"3. Reservation is further made to Article 20, paragraph 1. This reservation is in accordance with the vote cast by Denmark in the XVI General Assembly of the United Nations in 1961 when the Danish Delegation, referring to the preceding article concerning freedom of expression, voted against the prohibition against propaganda for war."

Egypt

[See chapter IV.3.]

Finland[19]

Reservations:

"With respect to article 10, paragraph 2 (b) and 3, of the Covenant, Finland declares that although juvenile offenders are, as a rule, segregated from adults, it does not deem appropriate to adopt an absolute prohibition not allowing for more flexible arrangements;

With respect to article 14, paragraph 7, of the Covenant, Fin- land declares that it is going to pursue its present practice, according to which a sentence can be changed to the detriment of the convicted person, if it is established that a member or an official of the court, the prosecutor or the legal counsel have through criminal or fraudulent activities obtained the acquittal of the defendant or a substantially more lenient penalty, or if false evidence has been presented with the same effect, and according to which an aggravated criminal case may be taken up for reconsideration if within a year until then unknown evidence is presented, which would have led to conviction or a substantially more severe penalty;

With respect to article 20, paragraph 1, of the Covenant, Fin- land declares that it will not apply the provisions of this paragraph, this being compatible with the standpoint Finland already expressed at the 16th United Nations General Assembly by voting against the prohibition of propaganda for war, on the grounds that this might endanger the freedom of expression referred in article 19 of the Covenant."

France[20,21]

Declarations and reservations:

(1) The Government of the Republic considers that, in accordance with Article 103 of the Charter of the United Nations, in case of conflict between its obligations under the Covenant and its obligations under the Charter (especially Articles 1 and 2 thereof), its obligations under the Charter will prevail.

(2) The Government of the Republic enters the following reservation concerning article 4, paragraph 1: firstly, the circumstances enumerated in article 16 of the Constitution in respect of its implementation, in article 1 of the Act of 3 April 1978 and in the Act of 9 August 1849 in respect of the declaration of a state of siege, in article 1 of Act No. 55-385 of 3 April 1955 in respect of the declaration of a state of emergency and which enable these instruments to be implemented, are to be understood as meeting the purpose of article 4 of the Covenant; and, secondly, for the purpose of interpreting and implementing article 16 of the Constitution of the French Republic, the terms "to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation" cannot limit the power of the President of the Republic to take "the measures required by circumstances".

(3) The Government of the Republic enters a reservation concerning articles 9 and 14 to the effect that these articles cannot impede enforcement of the rules pertaining to the disciplinary régime in the armies.

(4) The Government of the Republic declares that article 13 cannot derogate from chapter IV of Order No. 45-2658 of 2 November 1945 concerning the entry into, and sojourn in, France of aliens, nor from the other instruments concerning the expulsion of aliens in force in those parts of the territory of the Republic in which the Order of 2 November 1945 does not apply.

(5) The Government of the Republic interprets article 14, paragraph 5, as stating a general principle to which the law may make limited exceptions, for example, in the case of certain of- fences subjct to the initial and final adjudication of a police court and of criminal offences. However, an appeal against a final decision may be made to the Court of Cassation which rules on the legality of the decision concerned.

(6) The Government of the Republic declares that articles 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant will be implemented in accordance with articles 10, 11 and16 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 4 November 1950.

(7) The Government of the Republic declares that the term "war", appearing in article 20, paragraph1, is to be understood to mean war in contravention of international law and considers, in any case, that French legislation in this matter is adequate.

(8) In the light of article 2 of the Constitution of the French Republic, the French Government declares that article 27 is not applicable so far as the Republic is concerned.

Gambia

"For financial reasons free legal assistance for accused per- sons is limited in our constitution to persons charged with capital offences only. The Government of the Gambia therefore wishes to enter a reservation in respect of article 14 (3) (d) of the Covenant in question."

Germany[10,22]

"1. Articles 19, 21 and 22 in conjunction with Article 2 (1) of the Covenant shall be applied within the scope of Article 16 of the Convention of 4 November 1950 for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

"2. Article 14 (3) (d) of the Covenant shall be applied in such manner that it is for the court to decide whether an accused person held in custody has to appear in person at the hearing before the court of review (*Revisionsgericht*).

"3. Article 14 (5) of the Covenant shall be applied in such manner that:

(a) A further appeal does not have to be instituted in all cases solely on the grounds the accused person having been acquitted by the lower court-was convicted for the first time in the proceedings concerned by the appellate court.

(b) In the case of criminal offences of minor gravity the re- view by a higher tribunal of a decision not imposing imprisonment does not have to be admitted in all cases.

"4. Article 15 (1) of the Covenant shall be applied in such manner that when provision is made by law for the imposition of a lighter penalty the hitherto applicable law may for certain exceptional categories of cases remain applicable to criminal offences committed before the law was amended."

GUINEA

In accordance with the principle whereby all States whose policies are guided by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations are entitled to become parties to covenants affecting the interests of the international community, the Government of the Republic of Guinea considers that the provisions of article 48, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights are contrary to the principle of the universality of international treaties and the democratization of international relations.

GUYANA

In respect of sub-paragraph (d) of paragraph 3 of article 14

"While the Government of the Republic of Guyana accept the principle of Legal Aid in all appropriate criminal proceedings, is working towards that end and at present apply it in certain defined cases, the problems of implementation of a comprehensive Legal Aid Scheme are such that full application cannot be guaranteed at this time."

In respect of paragraph 6 of article 14

"While the Government of the Republic of Guyana accept the principle of compensation for wrongful imprisonment, it is not possible at this time to implement such a principle."

HUNGARY

[See chapter IV.3.]

ICELAND[23]

The ratification is accompanied by reservations with respect to the following provisions:

1. ...
2. Article 10, paragraph 2 (b), and paragraph 3, second sentence, with respect to the separation of juvenile prisoners from adults. Icelandic law in principle provides for such separation but it is not considered appropriate to accept an obligation in the absolute form called for in the provisions of the Covenant.
3. Article 13, to the extent that it is inconsistent with the Icelandic legal provisions in force relating to the right of aliens to object to a decision on their expulsion.
4. Article 14, paragraph 7, with respect to the resumption of cases which have already been tried. The Icelandic law of procedure has detailed provisions on this matter which it is not considered appropriate to revise.
5. Article 20, paragraph 1, with reference to the fact that a prohibition against propaganda for war could limit the freedom of expression. This reservation is consistent with the position of Iceland at the General Assembly at its 16th session.

Other provisions of the Covenant shall be inviolably observed.

INDIA

[See chapter IV.3.]

INDONESIA

Declaration:

"With reference to Article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Government of the Republic of Indonesia declares that, consistent with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation Among States, and the relevant paragraph of the Vienna Declaration and Program of Action of 1993, the words "the right of self-determination" appearing in this article do not apply to a section of people within a sovereign independent state and can not be construed as authorizing or encouraging any action which would dismember or impair, totally or in part, the territorial integrity or political unity of sovereign and independent states."

IRAQ

[See chapter IV.3.]

IRELAND[24]

Article 10, paragraph 2

Ireland accepts the principles referred to in paragraph 2 of article 10 and implements them as far as practically possible. It reserves the right to regard full implementation of these principles as objectives to be achieved progressively.

Article 19, paragraph 2

Ireland reserves the right to confer a monopoly on or require the licensing of broadcasting enterprises.

Article 20, paragraph 1

Ireland accepts the principle in paragraph 1 of article 20 and implements it as far as it is practicable. Having regard to the difficulties in formulating a specific offence capable of adjudication at a national level in such a form as to reflect the general principles of law recognised by the community of nations as well as the right to freedom of expression, Ireland reserves the right to postpone consideration of the possibility of introducing some legislative addition to, or variation of, existing law until such time as it may consider that such is necessary for the attainment of the objective of paragraph 1 of article 20.

ISRAEL

Reservation:

"With reference to Article 23 of the Covenant, and any other provision thereof to which the present reservation may be relevant, matters of personal status are governed in Israel by the religious law of the parties concerned.

"To the extent that such law is inconsistent with its obligations under the Covenant, Israel reserves the right to apply that law."

ITALY[25]

.....

Article 15, paragraph 1

With reference to article 15, paragraph 1, last sentence: "If, subsequent to the commission of the offence, provision is made by law for the imposition of a lighter penalty, the offender shall benefit thereby", the Italian Republic deems this provision to apply exclusively to cases in progress.

Consequently, a person who has already been convicted by a final decision shall not benefit from any provision made by law, subsequent to that decision, for the imposition of a lighter penalty.

Article 19, paragraph 3

The provisions of article 19, paragraph 3, are interpreted as being compatible with the existing licensing system for national radio and television and with the restrictions laid down by law for local radio and television companies and for stations relaying foreign programmes.

JAPAN

[See chapter IV.3.]

KUWAIT

Interpretative declaration regarding article 2, paragraph 1, and article 3:

Although the Government of Kuwait endorses the worthy principles embodied in these two articles as consistent with the provisions of the Kuwait Constitution in general and of its article 29 in particular, the rights to which the articles refer must be exercised within the limits set by Kuwaiti law.

Interpretative declaration regarding article 23:

The Government of Kuwait declares that the matters addressed by article 23 are governed by personal-status law, which is based on Islamic law. Where the provisions of that article conflict with Kuwaiti law, Kuwait will apply its national law.

Reservations concerning article 25 (b):

The Government of Kuwait wishes to formulate a reservation with regard to article 25(b). The provisions of this paragraph conflict with the Kuwaiti electoral law, which restricts the right to stand and vote in elections to males.

It further declares that the provisions of the article shall not apply to members of the armed forces or the police.

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA

"The acceptance and the accession to this Covenant by the Libyan Arab Republic shall in no way signify a recognition of Israel or be conducive to entry by the Libyan Arab Republic into such dealings with Israel as are regulated by the Covenant."

LIECHTENSTEIN[26]

Declarations concerning article 3:

"The Principality of Liechtenstein declares that it does not interpret the provisions of article 3 of the Covenant as constituting an impediment to the constitutional rules on the hereditary succession to the throne of the Reigning Prince."

Reservation concerning article 14 (1):

"The Principality of Liechtenstein reserves the right to apply the provisions of article 14, paragraph 1 of the Covenant, concerning the principle that hearings must be held and judgments pronounced in public, only within the limits deriving from the principles at present embodied in the Liechtenstein legislation on legal proceedings."

Reservation concerning article 17 (1):

"The Principality of Liechtenstein makes the reservation that the right to respect for family life, as guaranteed by article 17, paragraph 1 of the Covenant, shall be exercised, with regard to aliens, in accordance with the principles at present embodied in the legislation on aliens."

...

Reservation concerning article 24 (3):

"The Principality of Liechtenstein reserves the right to apply the Liechtenstein legislation according to which Liechtenstein nationality is granted under certain conditions."

Reservation concerning article 26:

"The Principality of Liechtenstein reserves the right to guarantee the rights contained in article 26 of the Covenant concerning the equality of all persons before the law and their entitlement without any discrimination to the equal protection of the law only in connection with other rights contained in the present Covenant."

LUXEMBOURG

"(a) The Government of Luxembourg considers that article 10, paragraph 3, which provides that juvenile offenders shall be segregated from adults and accorded treatment appropriate to their age and legal status, refers solely to the legal measures incorporated in the system for the protection of minors, which is the subject of the Luxembourg youth welfare act. With regard to other juvenile offenders falling within the sphere of ordinary law, the Government of Luxembourg wishes to retain the option of adopting measures that might be more flexible and be designed to serve the interests of the persons concerned."

"(b) The Government of Luxembourg declares that it is implementing article 14, paragraph 5, since that paragraph does not conflict with the relevant Luxembourg legal statutes, which provide that, following an acquittal or a conviction by a court of first instance, a higher tribunal may deliver a sentence, confirm the sentence passed or impose a harsher penalty for the same crime. However, the tribunal's decision does not give the person declared guilty on appeal the right to appeal that conviction to a higher appellate jurisdiction."

The Government of Luxembourg further declares that article 14, paragraph 5, shall not apply to persons who, under Luxembourg law, are remanded directly to a higher court or brought before the Assize Court."

"(c) The Government of Luxembourg accepts the provision in article 19, paragraph 2, provided that it does not preclude it from requiring broadcasting, television and film companies to be licensed."

"(d) The Government of Luxembourg declares that it does not consider itself obligated to adopt legislation in the field covered by article 20, paragraph 1, and that article 20 as a whole will be implemented taking into account the rights to freedom of thought, religion, opinion, assembly and association laid down in articles 18, 19 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and reaffirmed in articles 18, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant."

1 December 2004*

The Government of Luxembourg declares that it is implementing article 14, paragraph 5, since that paragraph does not conflict with the relevant Luxembourg legal statutes, which provide that, following an acquittal or a conviction by a court of first instance, a higher tribunal may deliver a sentence, confirm the sentence passed or impose a harsher penalty for the same crime. However, the tribunal's decision does not give the person declared guilty on appeal the right to appeal that conviction to a higher appellate jurisdiction.

The Government of Luxembourg further declares that article 14, paragraph 5, shall not apply to persons who, under Luxembourg law, are remanded directly to a higher court.

*   *[Within a period of 12 months from the date of circulation of the depositary notification (i.e. 1 December 2003), none of the Contracting States to the above Covenant notified the Secretary-General of an objection. Consequently the modified reservation is deemed to have been accepted for deposit upon the expiration of the 12-month period, i.e., on 1 December 2004.]*

MALDIVES[27]

Reservation:

"The application of the principles set out in Article 18 of the Covenant shall be without prejudice to the Constitution of the Republic of Maldives."

MALTA

Reservations:

"1. Article 13 - The Government of Malta endorses the principles laid down in article 13. However, in the present circumstances it cannot comply entirely with the provisions of this article;

2. Article 14 (2) - The Government of Malta declares that it interprets paragraph 2 of article 14 of the Covenant in the sense that it does not preclude any particular law from imposing upon any person charged under such law the burden of proving particular facts;

3. Article 14 (6) - While the Government of Malta accepts the principle of compensation for wrongful imprisonment, it is not possible at this time to implement such a principle in accordance with article 14, paragraph 6, of the Covenant;

4. Article 19 - The Government of Malta desiring to avoid any uncertainty as regards the application of article 19 of the Covenant declares that the Constitution of Malta allow such restrictions to be imposed upon public officers in regard to their freedom of expression as are reasonably justifiable in a democratic society. The code of Conduct of public officers in Malta precludes them from taking an active part in political discussions or other political activity during working hours or on the premises.

"The Government of Malta also reserves the right not to apply article 19 to the extent that this may be fully compatible with Act 1 of 1987 entitled "An act to regulate the limitations on the political activities of aliens", and this in accordance with Article 16 of the Convention of Rome (1950) for the protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms or with Section 41 (2) (a) (ii) of the Constitution of Malta;

"5. Article 20 - The Government of Malta interprets article 20 consistently with the rights conferred by Articles 19 and 21 of the Covenant but reserves the right not to introduce any legislation for the purposes of article 20;

"6. Article 22 - the Government of Malta reserves the right not to apply article 22 to the extent that existing legislive measures may not be fully compatible with this article.

MAURITANIA

Reservations:

Article 18

1. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right shall include freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice, and freedom, either individually or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practice and teaching.

2. No one shall be subject to coercion which would impair his freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice.

3. Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs may be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law and are necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others.

4. The States Parties to the present Covenant undertake to have respect for the liberty of parents and, when applicable, legal guardians to ensure the religious and moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions.

The Mauritanian Government, while accepting the provisions set out in article 18 concerning freedom of thought, conscience and religion, declares that their application shall be without prejudice to the Islamic Shariah.

Article 23, paragraph 4

States Parties to the present Covenant shall take appropriate steps to ensure equality of rights and responsibilities of spouses as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution. In the case of dissolution, provision shall be made for the necessary protection of any children.

The Mauritanian Government interprets the provisions of article 23, paragraph 4, on the rights and responsibilities of spouses as to marriage as not affecting in any way the prescriptions of the Islamic Shariah.

MEXICO[28]

Interpretative statements:

Article 9, paragraph 5

Under the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States and the relevant implementing legislation, every individual enjoys the guarantees relating to penal matters embodied therein, and consequently no person may be unlawfully arrested or detained. However, if by reason of false accusation or complaint any individual suffers an infringement of this basic right, he has, *inter alia* , under the provisions of the appropriate laws, an enforceable right to just compensation.

Article 18

Under the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States, every person is free to profess his preferred religious belief and to practice its ceremonies, rites and religious acts, with the limitation, with regard to public religious acts, that they must be performed in places of worship and, with regard to education, that studies carried out in establishments designed for the professional education of ministers of religion are not officially recognized. The Government of Mexico believes that these limitations are included among those established in paragraph 3 of this article.

Reservations:

Article 13

The Government of Mexico makes a reservation to this article, in view of the present text of article 33 of the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States.

Article 25, subparagraph (b)

The Government of Mexico also makes a reservation to this provision, since article 130 of the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States provides that ministers of religion shall have neither a passive vote nor the right to form associations for political purposes.

MONACO

Interpretative declarations and reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Government of Monaco declares that it does not interpret the provisions of article 2, paragraphs 1 and 2, and articles 3 and 25 as constituting an impediment to the constitutional rules on the devolution of the Crown, according to which succession to the Throne shall take place within the direct legitimate line of the Reigning Prince, in order of birth, with priority being given to male descendants within the same degree of relationship, or of those concerning the exercise of the functions of the Regency.

The Princely Government declares that the implementation of the principle set forth in article 13 shall not affect the texts in force on the entry and stay of foreigners in the Principality or of those on the expulsion of foreigners from Monegasque territory.

The Princely Government interprets article 14, paragraph 5, as embodying a general principle to which the law can introduce limited exceptions. This is particularly true with respect to certain offences that, in the first and last instances, are under the jurisdiction of the police court, and with respect to offences of a criminal nature. Furthermore, verdicts in the last instance can be appealed before the Court of Judicial Review, which shall rule on their legality.

The Princely Government declares that it considers article 19 to be compatible with the existing system of monopoly and authorization applicable to radio and television corporations.

The Princely Government, recalling that the exercise of the rights and freedoms set forth in articles 21 and 22 entails duties and responsibilities, declares that it interprets these articles as not prohibiting the application of requirements, conditions, restrictions or penalties which are prescribed by law and which are necessary in a democratic society to national security, territorial integrity or public safety, the defence of order and the prevenion or crime, the protection of health or morals, and the protection of the reputation of others, or in order to prevent the disclosure of confidential information or to guarantee the authority and impartiality of the judiciary.

The Princely Government formulates a reservation concerning article 25, which shall not impede the application of article 25 of the Constitution and of Order No. 1730 of 7 May 1935 on public employment.

Article 26, together with article 2, paragraph 1, and article 25, is interpreted as not excluding the distinction in treatment between Monegasque and foreign nationals permitted under article 1, paragraph 2, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, taking into account the distinctions established in articles 25 and 32 of the Monegasque Constitution.

MONGOLIA

[See chapter IV.3.]

NETHERLANDS[29]

Reservations:

"Article 10

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands subscribes to the principle set out in paragraph 1 of this article, but it takes the view that ideas about the treatment of prisoners are so liable to change that it does not wish to be bound by the obligations set out in paragraph 2 and paragraph 3 (second sentence) of this article.

"Article 12, paragraph 1

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands regards the Netherlands and the Netherlands Antilles as separate territories of a State for the purpose of this provision.

"Article 12, paragraphs 2 and 4

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands regards the Netherlands and the Netherlands Antilles as separate countries for the purpose of these provisions.

"Article 14, paragraph 3 (d)

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands reserves the statutory option of removing a person charged with a criminal offence from the court room in the interests of the proper conduct of the proceedings.

"Article 14, paragraph 5

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands reserves the statutory power of the Supreme Court of the Netherlands to have sole jurisdiction to try certain categories of persons charged with serious offences committed in the discharge of a public office.

"Article 14, paragraph 7

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts this provision only insofar as no obligations arise from it further to those set out in article 68 of the Criminal Code of the Netherlands and article 70 of the Criminal Code of the Netherlands Antilles as they now apply. They read:

"1. Except in cases where court decisions are eligible for review, no person may be prosecuted again for an offence in respect of which a court in the Netherlands or the Netherlands Antilles has delivered an irrevocable judgement.

"2. If the judgement has been delivered by some other court, the same person may not be prosecuted for the same of fence in the case of (I) acquittal or withdrawal of proceeding or (II) conviction followed by complete execution, remission or lapse of the sentence.

"Article 19, paragraph 2

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the provision with the proviso that it shall not prevent the Kingdom from requiring the licensing of broadcasting, television or cinema enterprises.

"Article 20, paragraph 1

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not accept the obligation set out in this provision in the case of the Netherlands."

"[The Kingdom of the Netherlands] clarify that although the reservations [...] are partly of an interpretational nature, [it] has preferred reservations to interpretational declarations in all cases, since if the latter form were used doubt might arise concerning whether the text of the Covenant allows for the interpretation put upon it. By using the reservation form the Kingdom of the Netherlands wishes to ensure in all cases that the relevant obligations arising out of the Covenant will not apply to the Kingdom, or will apply only in the way indicated.

NEW ZEALAND

Reservations:

"The Government of New Zealand reserves the right not to apply article 10 (2) (b) or article 10 (3) in circumstances where the shortage of suitable facilities makes the mixing of juveniles and adults unavoidable; and further reserves the right not to apply article 10 (3) where the interests of other juveniles in an establishment require the removal of a particular juvenile offender or where mixing is considered to be of benefit to the persons concerned.

"The Government of New Zealand reserves the right not to apply article 14 (6) to the extent that it is not satisfied by the existing system for *ex gratia* payments to persons who suffer as a result of a miscarriage of justice.

"The Government of New Zealand having legislated in the areas of the advocacy of national and racial hatred and the exciting of hostility or ill will against any group of persons, and having regard to the right of freedom of speech, reserves the right not to introduce further legislation with regard to article 20.

"The Government of New Zealand reserves the right not to apply article 22 as it relates to trade unions to the extent that existing legislative measures, enacted to ensure effective trade union representation and encourage orderly industrial relations, may not be fully compatible with that article."

NORWAY[30]

Subject to reservations to article 10, paragraph 2 (b) and paragraph 3 "with regard to the obligation to keep accused juvenile persons and juvenile offenders segregated from adults" and to article 14, paragraphs 5 and 7 and to article 20, paragraph 1.

19 September 1995

[The Government of Norway declares that] the entry into force of an amendment to the Criminal Procedure Act, which introduces the right to have a conviction reviewed by a higher court in all cases, the reservation made by the Kingdom of Norway with respect to article 14, paragraph 5 of the Covenant shall continue to apply only in the following exceptional circumstances:

1. *"Riksrett" (Court of Impeachment)*

According to article 86 of the Norwegian Constitution, a special court shall be convened in criminal cases against members of the Government, the Storting (Parliament) or the Supreme Court, with no right of appeal.

2. *Conviction by an appellate court*

In cases where the defendant has been acquitted in the first instance, but convicted by an appellate court, the conviction may not be appealed on grounds of error in the assessment of evidence in relation to the issue of guilt. If the appellate court convicting the defendant is the Supreme Court, the conviction may not be appealed whatsoever.

PAKISTAN

Upon signature

Reservation:

"The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan reserves its right to attach appropriate reservations, make declarations and state its understanding in respect of various provisions of the Covenant at the time of ratification."

REPUBLIC OF KOREA[31]

Reservations:

The Government of the Republic of Korea [declares] that the provisions of [...], article 22 [...] of the Covenant shall be so applied as to be in conformity with the provisions of the local laws including the Constitution of the Republic of Korea.

ROMANIA

Upon signature:

The Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania declares that the provisions of article 48, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights are at variance with the principle that all States have the right to become parties to multilateral treaties governing matters of general interest.

Upon ratification:

(a) The State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the provisions of article 48 (1) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights are inconsistent with the principle that multilateral international treaties whose purposes concern the international community as a whole must be open to universal participation.

(b) The State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the maintenance in a state of dependence of certain territories referred to in article 1 (3) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations and the instruments adopted by the Organization on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, including the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, adopted unanimously by the United Nations General Assembly in its resolution 2625 (XXV) of 1970, which solemnly proclaims the duty of States to promote the realization of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in order to bring a speedy end to colonialism.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 26 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and of paragraph 1 of article 48 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, under which a number of States cannot become parties to these Covenants, are of a discriminatory nature and considers that the Covenants, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, should be open for participation by all States concerned without any discrimination or limitation.

SAMOA

Declarations:

"The term "forced or compulsory labour" as appears in article 8 paragraph 3 of the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights of 1966 shall be interpreted as being compatible with that expressed in article 8 (2) (a) (b) (c) (d) of the Constitution of the Independent State of Samoa 1960, which stipulates that the "term forced or compulsory labour" shall include, (a) any work required to be done in consequence of a sentence of a Court; or (b) any service of a military character or, in the case of conscientious objectors, service exacted instead of compulsory military service; or (c) any service exacted in case of an emergency or calamity threatening life or well-being of the community; or (d) any work or service which is required by Samoan custom or which forms part of normal civic obligations.

The Government of the Independent State of Samoa considers that article 10 paragraphs 2 and 3, which provides that juvenile offenders shall be segregated from adults and accorded treatment appropriate to their age and legal status refers solely to the legal measures incorporated in the system for the protection of minors, which is addressed by the Young Offenders Act 2007 (Samoa)."

SLOVAKIA[7]

SWEDEN

Sweden reserves the right not to apply the provisions of article 10, paragraph 3, with regard to the obligation to segregate juvenile offenders from adults, the provisions of article 14, paragraph 7, and the provisions of article 20, paragraph 1, of the Covenant.

SWITZERLAND[32]

Reservations:

(a) *Reservation concerning article 12, paragraph 1:*

.....

(b) *Reservation concerning article 20:*

Switzerland reserves the right not to adopt further measures to ban propaganda for war, which is prohibited by article 20, paragraph 1.

...

(c) *Reservation concerning article 25, subparagraph (b):*

The present provision shall be applied without prejudice to the cantonal and communal laws, which provide for or permit elections within assemblies to be held by a means other than secret ballot.

(d) *Reservation concerning article 26:*

The equality of all persons before the law and their entitlement without any discrimination to the equal protection of the law shall be guaranteed only in connection with other rights contained in the present Covenant.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

[See chapter IV.3.]

THAILAND

Interpretative declarations:

"The Government of Thailand declares that:

1. The term "self-determination" as appears in article 1, paragraph 1, of the Covenant shall be interpreted as being compatible with that expressed in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, adopted by the World Conference on Human Rights on 25 June 1993.

2. With respect to article 6, paragraph 5 of the Covenant, the Thai Penal Code enjoins, or in some cases allows much latitude for, the Court to take into account the offender's youth as a mitigating factor in handing down sentences. Whereas Section 74 of the code does not allow any kind of punishment levied upon any person below fourteen years of age, Section 75 of the same Code provides that whenever any person over fourteen years but not yet over seventeen years of age commits any act provided by the law to be an offence, the Court shall take into account the sense of responsibility and all other things concerning him in order to come to decision as to whether it is appropriate to pass judgment inflicting punishment on him or not. If the court does not deem it appropriate to pass judgment inflicting punishment, it shall proceed according to Section 74 (*viz* . to adopt other correction measures short of punishment) or if the court deems it appropriate to pass judgment inflicting punishment, it shall reduce the scale of punishment provided for such offence by one half. Section 76 of the same Code also states that whenever any person over seventeen years but not yet over twenty years of age, commits any act provided by the law to be an offence, the Court *may* , if it thinks fit, reduce the scale of the punishment provided for such offence by one third or one half. The reduction of the said scale will prevent the Court from passing any sentence of death. As a result, though in theory, sentence of death may be imposed for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years, but not below seventeen years of age,the Court always exercises its discretion under Section 75 to reduce the said scale of punishment, and in practice the death penalty has not been imposed upon any persons below eighteen years of age. Consequently, Thailand considers that in real terms it has already complied with the principles enshrined herein.

3. With respect to article 9, paragraph 3 of the Covenant, Section 87, paragraph 3 of the Criminal Procedure Code of Thailand provides that the arrested person shall not be kept in custody for more than forty-eight hours from the time of his arrival at the office of the administrative or police official, but the time for bringing the arrested person to the Court shall not be included in the said period of forty-eight hours. In case it is necessary for the purpose of conducting the inquiry, or there arises any other necessity, the period of forty-eight hours may be extended as long as such necessity persists, but in no case shall it be longer than seven days.

4. With respect to article 20 of the Covenant, the term "war" appearing in paragraph 1 is understood by Thailand to mean war in contravention of international law."

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO[33]

(i) The Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago reserves the right not to apply in full the provision of paragraph 2 of article 4 of the Covenant since section 7 (3) of its Constitution enables Parliament to enact legislation even though it is inconsistent with sections (4) and (5) of the said Constitution;

(ii) Where at any time there is a lack of suitable prison facilities, the Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago reserves the right not to apply article 10 (2) (b) and 10 (3) so far as those provisions require juveniles who are detained to be accommodated separately from adults;

(iii) The Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago reserves the right not to apply paragraph 2 of article 12 in view of the statutory provisions requiring persons intending to travel abroad to furnish tax clearance certificates;

(iv) The Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago reserves the right not to apply paragraph 5 of article 14 in view of the fact that section 43 of its Supreme Court of Judicature Act No. 12 of 1962 does not confer on a person convicted on indictment an unqualified right of appeal and that in particular cases, appeal to the Court of Appeal can only be done with the leave of the Court of Appeal itself or of the Privy Council;

(v) While the Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago accepts the principle of compensation for wrongful imprisonment, it is not possible at this time to implement such a principle in accordance with paragraph 6 of article 14 of the Covenant;

(vi) With reference to the last sentence of paragraph 1 of article 15-"If, subsequent to the commission of the offence, provision is made by law for the imposition of a lighter penalty, the offender shall benefit thereby", the Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago deems this provision to apply exclusively to cases in progress. Consequently, a person who has already been convicted by a final decision shall not benefit from any provision made by law, subsequent to that decision, for the imposition of a lighter penalty.

(vii) The Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago reserves the right to impose lawful and or reasonable restrictions with respect to the right of assembly under article 21 of the Covenant;

(viii) The Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago reserves the right not to apply the provision of article 26 of the Covenant in so far as it applies to the holding of property in Trinidad and Tobago, in view of the fact that licences may be granted to or withheld from aliens under the Aliens Landholding Act of Trinidad and Tobago.

TURKEY

Declarations and reservation:

The Republic of Turkey declares that; it will implement its obligations under the Covenant in accordance to the obligations under the Charter of the United Nations (especially Article 1 and 2 thereof).

The Republic of Turkey declares that it will implement the provisions of this Covenant only to the States with which it has diplomatic relations.

The Republic of Turkey declares that this Convention is ratified exclusively with regard to the national territory where the Constitution and the legal and administrative order of the Republic of Turkey are applied.

The Republic of Turkey reserves the right to interpret and apply the provisions of Article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights in accordance with the related provisions and rules of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey and the Treaty of Lausanne of 24 July 1923 and its Appendixes.

UKRAINE

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratifica- tion:

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 26 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and of paragraph 1 of article 48 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, under which a number of States cannot become parties to these Covenants, are of a discriminatory nature and considers that the Covenants, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, should be open for participation by all States concerned without any discrimination or limitation.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND[34]

Upon signature:

"First, the Government of the United Kingdom declare their understanding that, by virtue of Article 103 of the Charter of the United Nations, in the event of any conflict between their obligations under Article 1 of the Covenant and their obligations under the Charter (in particular, under Articles 1, 2 and 73 thereof) their obligations under the Charter shall prevail.

"Secondly, the Government of the United Kingdom declare that:

"(a) In relation to Article 14 of the Covenant, they must reserve the right not to apply, or not to apply in full, the guarantee of free legal assistance contained in sub-paragraph (d) of paragraph 3 in so far as the shortage of legal practitioners and other considerations render the application of this guarantee in British Honduras, Fiji and St. Helena impossible;

"(b) In relation to Article 23 of the Covenant, they must reserve the right not to apply the first sentence of paragraph 4 in so far as it concerns any inequality which may arise from the operation of the law of domicile;

"(c) In relation to Article 25 of the Covenant, they must reserve the right not to apply:

"(i) Sub-paragraph (b) in so far as it may require the establishment of an elected legislature in Hong Kong and the introduction of equal suffrage, as between different electoral rolls, for elections in Fiji; and

"(ii) Sub-paragraph (c) in so far as it applies to jury service in the Isle of Man and to the employment of married women in the Civil Service of Northern Ireland, Fiji, and Hong Kong.

"Lastly, the Government of the United Kingdom declare that the provisions of the Covenant shall not apply to Southern Rhodesia unless and until they inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations that they are in a position to ensure that the obligations imposed by the Covenant in respect of that territory can be fully implemented."

Upon ratification:

"Firstly the Government of the United Kingdom maintain their declaration in respect of article 1 made at the time of signature of the Covenant.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right to apply to members of and persons serving with the armed forces of the Crown and to persons lawfully detained in penal establishments of whatever character such laws and procedures as they may from time to time deem to be necessary for the preservation of service and custodial discipline and their acceptance of the provisions of the Covenant is subject to such restrictions as may for these purposes from time to time be authorised by law.

"Where at any time there is a lack of suitable prison facilities or where the mixing of adults and juveniles is deemed to be mutually beneficial, the Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right not to apply article 10 (2) (b) and 10 (3), so far as those provisions require juveniles who are detained to be accommodated separately from adults, and not to apply article 10 (2) (a) in Gibraltar, Montserrat and the Turks and Caicos Islands in so far as it requires segregation of accused and convicted persons.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right not to apply article 11 in Jersey.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right to interpret the provisions of article 12 (1) relating to the territory of a State as applying separately to each of the territories comprising the United Kingdom and its dependencies.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right to continue to apply such immigration legislation governing entry into, stay in and departure from the United Kingdom as they may deem necessary from time to time and, accordingly, their acceptance of article 12 (4) and of the other provisions of the Covenant is subject to the provisions of any such legislation as regards persons not at the time having the right under the law of the United Kingdom to enter and remain in the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom also reserves a similar right in regard to each of its dependent territories.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right not to apply article 13 in Hong Kong in so far as it confers a right of review of a decision to deport an alien and a right to be represented for this purpose before the competent authority.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right not to apply or not to apply in full the guarantee of free legal assistance in sub-paragraph (d) of paragraph 3 of article 14 in so far as the shortage of legal practitioners renders the application of this guarantee impossible in the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, the Falkland Islands, the Gilbert Islands, the Pitcairn Islands Group, St. Helena and Dependencies and Tuvalu.

"The Government of the United Kingdom interpret article 20 consistently with the rights conferred by articles 19 and 21 of the Covenant and having legislated in matters of practical concern in the interests of public order *(ordre public)* reserve the right not to introduce any further legislation. The United Kingdom also reserve a similar right in regard to each of its dependent territories.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right to postpone the application of paragraph 3 of article 23 in regard to a small number of customary marriages in the Solomon Islands.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right to enact such nationality legislation as they may deem necessary from time to time to reserve the acquisition and possession of citizenship under such legislation to those having sufficient connection with the United Kingdom or any of its dependent territories and accordingly their acceptance of article 24 (3) and of the other provisions of the Covenant is subject to the provisions of any such legislation.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right not to apply sub-paragraph (b) of article 25 in so far as it may require the establishment of an elected Executive or Legislative Council in Hong Kong [...].

"Lastly, the Government ofhe United Kingdom declare that the provisions of the Covenant shall not apply to Southern Rhodesia unless and until they inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations that they are in a position to ensure that the obligations imposed by the Covenant in respect of that territory can be fully implemented."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Reservations:

"(1) That article 20 does not authorize or require legislation or other action by the United States that would restrict the right of free speech and association protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

"(2) That the United States reserves the right, subject to its Constitutional constraints, to impose capital punishment on any person (other than a pregnant woman) duly convicted under existing or future laws permitting the imposition of capital punishment, including such punishment for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age.

"(3) That the United States considers itself bound by article 7 to the extent that `cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment' means the cruel and unusual treatment or punishment prohibited by the Fifth, Eighth, and/or Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

"(4) That because U.S. law generally applies to an offender the penalty in force at the time the offence was committed, the United States does not adhere to the third clause of paragraph 1 of article 15.

"(5) That the policy and practice of the United States are generally in compliance with and supportive of the Covenant's provisions regarding treatment of juveniles in the criminal justice system. Nevertheless, the United States reserves the right, in exceptional circumstances, to treat juveniles as adults, notwithstanding paragraphs 2 (b) and 3 of article 10 and paragraph 4 of article 14. The United States further reserves to these provisions with respect to States with respect to individuals who volunteer for military service prior to age 18."

Understandings:

"(1) That the Constitution and laws of the United States guarantee all persons equal protection of the law and provide extensive protections against discrimination. The United States understands distinctions based upon race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, proerty, birth or any other status - as those terms are used in article 2, paragraph 1 and article 26 - to be permitted when such distinctions are, at minimum, rationally related to a legitimate governmental objective. The United States further understands the prohibition in paragraph 1 of article 4 upon discrimination, in time of public emergency, based `solely' on the status of race, colour, sex, language, religion or social origin, not to bar distinctions that may have a disproportionate effect upon persons of a particular status.

"(2) That the United States understands the right to compensation referred to in articles 9 (5) and 14 (6) to require the provision of effective and enforceable mechanisms by which a victim of an unlawful arrest or detention or a miscarriage of justice may seek and, where justified, obtain compensation from either the responsible individual or the appropriate governmental entity. Entitlement to compensation may be subject to the reasonable requirements of domestic law.

"(3) That the United States understands the reference to `exceptional circumstances' in paragraph 2 (a) of article 10 to permit the imprisonment of an accused person with convicted persons where appropriate in light of an individual's overall dangerousness, and to permit accused persons to waive their right to segregation from convicted persons. The United States further understands that paragraph 3 of article 10 does not diminish the goals of punishment, deterrence, and incapacitation as additional legitimate purposes for a penitentiary system.

"(4) That the United States understands that subparagraphs 3 (b) and (d) of article 14 do not require the provision of a criminal defendant's counsel of choice when the defendant is provided with court-appointed counsel on grounds of indigence, when the defendant is financially able to retain alternative counsel, or when imprisonment is not imposed. The United States further understands that paragraph 3 (e) does not prohibit a requirement that the defendant make a showing that any witness whose attendance he seeks to compel is necessary for his defense. The United States understands the prohibition upon double jeopardy in paragraph 7 to apply only when the judgment of acquittal has been rendered by a court of the same governmental unit, whether the Federal Government or a constituent unit, as is seeking a new trial for the same cause.

"(5) That the United States understands that this Covenant shall be implemented by the Federal Government to the extent that it exercises legislative and judicial jurisdiction over the matters covered therein, and otherwise by the state and local governments; to the extent that state and local governments exercise jurisdiction over such matters, the Federal Government shall take measures appropriate to the Federal system to the end that the competent authorities of the state or local governments may take appropriate measures for the fulfillment of the Covenant."

Declarations:

"(1) That the United States declares that the provisions of articles 1 through 27 of the Covenant are not self-executing.

"(2) That it is the view of the United States that States Party to the Covenant should wherever possible refrain from imposing any restrictions or limitations on the exercise of the rights recognized and protected by the Covenant, even when such restrictions and limitations are permissible under the terms of the Covenant. For the United States, article 5, paragraph 2, which provides that fundamental human rights existing in any State Party may not be diminished on the pretext that the Covenant recognizes them to a lesser extent, has particular relevance to article 19, paragraph 3 which would permit certain restrictions on the freedom of expression. The United States declares that it will continue to adhere to the requirements and constraints of its Constitution in respect to all such restrictions and limitations.

"(3) That the United States declares that the right referred to in article 47 may be exercised only in accordance with international law."

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Article 60, paragraph 5, of the Constitution of the Republic of Venezuela establishes that: "No person shall be convicted in criminal trial unless he has first been personally notified of the charges and heard in the manner prescribed by law. Persons accused of an offence against the *res publica* may be tried *in ab- sentia* , with the guarantees and in the manner prescribed by law". Venezuela is making this reservation because article 14, paragraph 3 (d), of the Covenant makes no provision for persons accused of an offence against the *res publica* to be tried *in absentia* .

VIET NAM

[See chapter IV.3.]

YEMEN[35]

[See chapter IV.3.]

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRALIA

18 September 2007

With regard to the reservation made by Maldives upon accession :

"The Government of Australia considers that the reservation with respect to article 18 of the Covenant is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Australia recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty is not permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

Furthermore, the Government of Australia considers that the Republic of Maldives, through this reservation, is purporting to make the application of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights subject to the provisions of constitutional law in force in the Republic of Maldives. As a result, it is unclear to what extent the Republic of Maldives considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the Republic of Maldives to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Australia considers that the reservation with respect to article 18 of the Covenant is subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation, pursuant to Article 27 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform a treaty.

Further, the Government of Australia recalls that according to article 4 (2) of the Covenant, no derogation of article 18 is permitted.

For the above reasons, the Government of Australia objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and expresses the hope that the Republic of Maldives will soon be able to withdraw its reservation in light of the ongoing process of a revision of the Maldivian Constitution.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Australia and the Republic of Maldives."

AUSTRIA

18 September 2007

With regard to the reservation made by Maldives upon accession:

"The Government of Austria has carefully examined the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Maldives on 19 September 2006 in respect of Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of Austria is of the opinion that reservations which consist in a general reference to a system of norms (like the constitution of the legal order of the reserving State) without specifying the contents thereof leave it uncertain to which extent that State accepts to be bound by the obligations under the treaty. Moreover, those norms may be subject to changes.

The reservation made by the Republic of Maldives is therefore not sufficiently precise to make it possible to determine the restrictions that are introduced into the agreement. The Government of Austria is therefore of the opinion that the reservation is capable of contravening the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Austria therefore regards the above-mentioned reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Austria and the Republic of Maldives."

BELGIUM

6 November 1984

[The Belgian Government] wishes to observe that the sphere of application of article 11 is particularly restricted. In fact, article 11 prohibits imprisonment only when there is no reason for resorting to it other than the fact that the debtor is unable to fulfil a contractual obligation. Imprisonment is not incompatible with article 11 when there are other reasons for imposing this penalty, for example when the debtor, by acting in bad faith or through fraudulent manoeuvres, has placed himself in the position of being unable to fulfil his obligations. This interpretation of article 11 can be confirmed by reference to the *travaux préparatoires* (see document A/2929 of 1 July 1955).

After studying the explanations provided by the Congo concerning its reservation, [the Belgian Government] has provisionally concluded that this reservation is unnecessary. It is its understanding that the Congolese legislation authorizes imprisonment for debt when other means of enforcement have failed when the amount due exceeds 20,000 CFA francs and when the debtor, between 18 and 60 years of age, makes himself insolvent in bad faith. The latter condition is sufficient to show that there is no contradiction between the Congolese legislation and the letter and the spirit of article 11 of the Covenant.

By virtue of article 4, paragraph 2, of the aforementioned Covenant, article 11 is excluded from the sphere of application of the rule which states that in the event of an exceptional public emergency, the States Parties to the Covenant may, in certain conditions, take measures derogating from their obligations under the Covenant. Article 11 is one of the articles containing a provision from which no derogation is permitted in any circumstances. Any reservation concerning that article would destroy its effects and would therefore be in contradiction with the letter and the spirit of the Covenant.

Consequently, and without prejudice to its firm beliefthat Congolese law is in complete conformity with the provisions of article 11 of the Covenant, [the Belgian Government] fears that the reservation made by the Congo may, by reason of its very principle, constitute a precedent which might have considerable effects at the international level.

[The Belgian Government] therefore hopes that this reservation will be withdrawn and, as a precautionary measure, wishes to raise an objection to that reservation.

5 October 1993

The Government of Belgium wishes to raise an objection to the reservation made by the United States of America regarding article 6, paragraph 5, of the

Covenant, which prohibits the imposition of the sentence of death for crimes committed by persons below 18 years of age.

The Government of Belgium considers the reservation to be incompatible with the provisions and intent of article 6 of the Covenant which, as is made clear by article 4, paragraph 2, of the Covenant, establishes minimum measures to protect the right to life.

The expression of this objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Belgium and the United States of America.

CANADA

18 September 2007

With regard to the reservation made by Maldives upon accession:

"The Government of Canada has carefully examined the reservation made by the Government of the Maldives upon acceding to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, in accordance with which the "application of the principles set out in Article 18 of the Covenant shall be without prejudice to the Constitution of the Republic of Maldives".

The Government of Canada considers that a reservation which consists of a general reference to national law constitutes, in reality, a reservation with a general, indeterminate scope, such that it makes it impossible to identify the modifications to obligations under the Covenant, which it purports to introduce and it does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Covenant.

The Government of Canada notes that the reservation made by the Government of the Maldives which addresses one of the most essential provisions of the Covenant, to which no derogation is allowed according to article 4 of the Covenant, is in contradiction with the object and purpose of the Covenant. The Government of Canada therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Maldives.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Covenant between Canada and the Maldives."

CYPRUS

26 November 2003

With regard to the declaration made by the Turkey upon ratification:

".....the Government of the Republic of Cyprus has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Republic of Turkey to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (New York, 16 December 1966) on 23 September 2003, in respect of the implementation of the provisions of the Convention only to the States Parties which it recognizes and with which it has diplomatic relations.

In the view of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus, this declaration amounts to a reservation. This reservation creates uncertainty as to the States Parties in respect of which Turkey is undertaking the obligations in the Covenant, and raises doubt as to the commitment of Turkey to the object and purpose of the said Covenant. The Government of the Republic of Cyprus therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Turkey to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This reservation or the objection to it shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Cyprus and the Republic of Turkey."

CZECH REPUBLIC[7]

12 September 2007

With regard to the reservation made by Maldives upon accession:

"The Government of the Czech Republic has carefully examined the contents of the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives upon accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted on 16 December 1966, in respect of Article 18 thereof.

The Government of the Czech Republic is of the opinion that the aforementioned reservation is in contradiction with the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a State party to a treaty may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform according to the obligations set out by the treaty. Furthermore, the reservation consists of a general reference to the Constitution without specifying its content and as such does not clearly define to other Parties to the Covenant the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Covenant.

The Government of the Czech Republic recalls that it is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Czech Republic therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to the Covenant. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Czech Republic and the Republic of Maldives, without the Republic of Maldives benefiting from its reservation.".

DENMARK

1 October 1993

With regard to the reservations made by the United States of America:

"Having examined the contents of the reservations made by the United States of America, Denmark would like to recall article 4, para 2 of the Covenant according to which no derogation from a number of fundamental articles, *inter alia* 6 and 7, may be made by a State Party even in time of public emergency which threatens the life of the nation.

In the opinion of Denmark, reservation (2) of the United States with respect to capital punishment for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age as well as reservation (3) with respect to article 7 constitute general derogations from articles 6 and 7, while according to article 4, para 2 of the Covenant such derogations are not permitted.

Therefore, and taking into account that articles 6 and 7 are protecting two of the most basic rights contained in the Covenant, the Government of Denmark regards the said reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant, and consequently Denmark objects to the reservations.

These objections do not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Denmark and the United States.

4 October 2001

With regard to the reservations made by the Botswana upon ratification:

"The Government of Denmark has examined the contents of the reservations made by the Government of

Botswana to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The reservations refer to legislation in force in Botswana as regards the scope of application of two core provisions of the Covenant, Articles 7 and 12 para.3. The Government of Denmark considers that the reservations raise doubts as to the commitment of Botswana to fulfill her obligations under the Covenant and are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

For these reasons, the Government of Denmark objects to these reservations made by the Government of Botswana. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant in its entirety between Botswana and Denmark without Botswana benefiting from the reservations."

ESTONIA

12 September 2007

With regard to the reservation made by Maldives upon accession:

"The Government of Estonia has carefully examined the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Government of Estonia considers the reservation to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant as with this reservation the application of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is made subject to the provisions of constitutional law. The Government of Estonia is of the view that the reservation makes it unclear to what extent the Republic of Maldives considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the Republic of Maldives to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Estonia therefore objects to the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and expresses the hope that the Republic of Maldives will soon be able to withdraw its reservation in light of the ongoing process of the revision of the Maldivian Constitution.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights between Estonia and the Republic of Maldives."

FINLAND

28 September 1993

With regard to the reservations, understandings and declarations made by the United States of America:

"... It is recalled that under international treaty law, the name assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified, does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. Understanding (1) pertaining to articles 2, 4 and 26 of the Covenant is therefore considered to constitute in substance a reservation to the Covenant, directed at some of its most essential provisions, namely those concerning the prohibition of discrimination. In the view of the Government of Finland, a reservation of this kind is contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant, as specified in article 19(c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

As regards reservation (2) concerning article 6 of the Coven- ant, it is recalled that according to article 4(2), no restrictions of articles 6 and 7 of the Covenant are allowed for. In the view of the Government of Finland, the right to life is of fundamental importance in the Covenant and the said reservation therefore is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

As regards reservation (3), it is in the view of the Government of Finland subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform a treaty.

For the above reasons the Government of Finland objects to reservations made by the United States to articles 2, 4 and 26 [*cf* . Understanding (1)], to article 6 [*cf* . Reservation (2)] and to article 7 [cf. Reservation (3)]. However, the Government of Finland does not consider that this objection constitutes an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Finland and the United States of America.

25 July 1997

With regard to declarations and the reseration made by Kuwait:

"The Government of Finland notes that according to the interpretative declarations the application of certain articles of the Covenant is in a general way subjected to national law. The Government of Finland considers these interpretative declarations as reservations of a general kind.

The Government of Finland is of the view that such general reservations raise doubts as to the commitment of Kuwait to the object and purpose of the Covenant and would recall that a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant shall not be permitted. As regards the reservation made to article 25 (b), the Government of Finland wishes to refer to its objection to the reservation made by Kuwait to article 7 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

It is the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Finland is further of the view that general reservations of the kind made by the Government of Kuwait, which do not clearly specify the extent of the derogation from the provisions of the covenant, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Kuwait to the [said Covenant] which are considered to be inadmissible.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Covenant between Kuwait and Finland."

13 October 2004

With regard to declarations and the reservation made by Turkey upon ratification:

"The Government of Finland has examined the declarations and reservation made by the Republic of Turkey to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Government of Finland notes that the Republic of Turkey reserves the right to interpret and apply the provisions of Article 27 of the Covenant in accordance with the related provisions and rules of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey and the Treaty of Lausanne of 24 July 1923 and its Appendixes.

The Government of Finland emphasises the great importance of the rights of minorities provided for in Article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The reference to the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey is of a general nature and does not clearly specify the content of the reservation. The Government of Finland therefore wishes to declare that it assumes that the Government of the Republic of Turkey will ensure the implementation of the rights of minorities recognised in the Covenant and will do its utmost to bring its national legislation into compliance with the obligations under the Covenant with a view to withdrawing the reservation. This declaration does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Turkey and Finland."

15 November 2005

With regard to reservations made by Mauritania upon ratification:

"The Government of Finland has carefully examined the contents of the declaration made by the Government of Mauritania on Article 18 and paragraph 4 of Article 23 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of Finland notes that a reservation which consists of a general reference to religious or other national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define to other Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Convention and creates serious doubts as to the commitment of the receiving State to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. Such reservations are, furthermore, subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law asjustification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

The Government of Finland notes that the reservations made by the Government of Mauritania, addressing some of the most essential provisions of the Covenant, and aiming to exclude the obligations under those provisions, are in contradiction with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the above-mentioned declaration made by the Government of Mauritania to the Covenant. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Islamic Republic of Mauritania and Finland. The Covenant will thus become operative between the two states without the Islamic Republic of Mauritania benefiting from its declarations."

14 September 2007

With regard to the reservation made by Maldives upon accession:

"The Government of Finland has examined the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Government of Finland notes that the Republic of Maldives reserves the right to interpret and apply the provisions of Article 18 of the Covenant in accordance with the related provisions and rules of the Constitution of the Republic of Maldives.

The Government of Finland notes that a reservation which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define to other Parties to the Covenant the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Covenant and creates serious doubts as to the commitment of the receiving State to fulfil its obligations under the Covenant. Such reservations are, furthermore, subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

Furthermore, the Government of Finland emphasises the great importance of the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion which is provided for in Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Government of Finland therefore wishes to declare that it assumes that the Government of the Republic of Maldives will ensure the implementation of the rights of freedom of thought, conscience and religion recognised in the Covenant and will do its utmost to bring its national legislation into compliance with the obligations under the Covenant with a view to withdrawing the reservation.

This declaration does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Maldives and Finland. The Covenant will thus become operative between the two states without the Republic of Maldives benefiting from its reservation."

FRANCE

The Government of the Republic takes objection to the reservation entered by the Government of the Republic of India to article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, as this reservation attaches conditions not provided for by the Charter of the United Nations to the exercise of the right of self-determination. The present declaration will not be deemed to be an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between the French Republic and the Republic of India.

4 October 1993

At the time of the ratification of [the said Covenant], the United States of America expressed a reservation relating to article 6, paragraph 5, of the Covenant, which prohibits the imposition of the death penalty for crimes committed by persons below 18 years of age.

France considers that this United States reservation is not valid, inasmuch as it is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Such objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between France and the United States.

15 October 2001

With regard to the reservation made by Botswana upon ratification:

The Government of the French Republic has studied Botswana's reservations to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The purpose of the two reservations is to limit Botswana's commitment to articles 7 and 12, paragraph 3, of the Covenant to the extent to which these provisions are compatible with sections 7 and 14 of the Constitution of Botswana.

The Government of the French Republic considers that the first reservation casts doubt upon Botswana's commitment and might nullify article 7 of the Covenant which prohibits in general terms torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Consequently, the Government of the French Republic objects to the Government of Botswana's reservation to article 7 of the Covenant.

18 November 2005

With regard to reservations made by Mauritania upon ratification:

“The Government of the French Republic has examined the declarations formulated by the Government of Mauritania upon acceding to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted on 16 December 1966, in accordance with which the Government of Mauritania, on the one hand, ‘while accepting the provisions set out in article 18 concerning freedom of thought, conscience and religion, declares that their application shall be without prejudice to the Islamic sharia’ and, on the other, ‘interprets the provisions of article 23, paragraph 4, on the rights and responsibilities of spouses as to marriage as not affecting in any way the prescriptions of the Islamic sharia’. By making the application of article 18 and the interpretation of article 23, paragraph 4, of the Covenant subject to the prescriptions of the Islamic sharia, the Government of Mauritania is, in reality, formulating reservations with a general, indeterminate scope, such that they make it impossible to identify the modifications to obligations under the Covenant, which they purport to introduce. The Government of the French Republic considers that the reservations thus formulated are likely to deprive the provisions of the Covenant of any effect and are contrary to the object and purpose thereof. It therefore enters an objection to these reservations. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between France and Mauritania.”

19 September 2007

With regard to the reservation made by Maldives upon accession:

The Government of the French Republic has reviewed the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives at the time of its accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 16 December 1966 to the effect that the Republic of Maldives intends to apply the principles relating to freedom of thought, conscience and religion set out in article 18 of twithout prejudice to its own Constitution.

The French Republic considers that by subordinating the general application of a right set out in the Covenant to its internal law, the Republic of Maldives is formulating a reservation that is likely to deprive a provision of the Covenant of any effect and makes it impossible for other States Parties to know the extent of its commitment.

The Government of the French Republic considers the reservation as contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant. It therefore objects to that reservation. This objection does not prevent the entry into force of the Covenant between the French Republic and the Republic of Maldives.

GERMANY[10]

*[See under "**Objections**" in chapter IV.3.]*

21 April 1982

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany objects to the [reservation (i) by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago]. In the opinion of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany it follows from the text and the history of the Covenant that the said reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant."

25 October 1990

With regard to interpretative declaration made by Algeria:

*[See under "**Objections**" in chapter IV.3.]*

28 May 1991

[The Federal Republic of Germany] interprets the declaration to mean that the Republic of Korea does not intend to restrict its obligations under article 22 by referring to its domestic legal system.

29 September 1993

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany objects to the United States' reservation referring to article 6, paragraph 5 of the Covenant, which prohibits capital punishment for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age. The reservation referring to this provision is incompatible with the text as well as the object and purpose of article 6, which, as made clear by paragraph 2 of article 4, lays down the minimum standard for the protection of the right to life.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany interprets the United States' `reservation' with regard to article 7 of the Covenant as a reference to article 2 of the Covenant, thus not in any way affecting the obligations of the United States of America as a state party to the Covenant."

10 July 1997

With regard to declarations and the reservation made by Kuwait:

*[See under "**Objections**" in chapter IV.3.]*

13 October 2004

With regard to declarations and the reservation made by Turkey upon ratification:

The Government of the Republic of Turkey has declared that it will implement the provisions of the Covenant only to the states with which it has diplomatic relations. Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Turkey has declared that it ratifies the Covenant exclusively with regard to the national territory where the Constitution and the legal and administrative order of the Republic of Turkey are applied. Furthermore, the Government of the Republic of Turkey has reserved the right to interpret and apply the provisions of Article 27 of the Covenant in accordance with the related provisions and rules of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey and the Treaty of Lausanne of 24 July 1923 and its Appendixes.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany would like to recall that it is in the common interest of all states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected and applied as to their object and purpose by all parties, and that states are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is therefore concerned about declarations and reservations such as those made and expressed by the Republic of Turkey with respect to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

However, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany believes these declarations do not aim to limit the Covenant's scope in relation to those states with which Turkey has established bonds under the Covenant, and that they do not aim to impose any other restrictions that are not provided for by the Covenant. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany attaches great importance to the rights guaranteed by Article 27 of the Covenant. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany understands the reservation expressed by the Government of the Republic of Turkey to mean that the rights guaranteed by Article 27 of the Covenant will also be granted to all minorities not mentioned in the provisions and rules referred to in the reservation."

15 November 2005

With regard to reservations made by Mauritania upon ratification:

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the declaration made by the Government of Mauritania on 17 November 2004 in respect of Articles 18 and 23 (4) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that the limitations set out therein leave it unclear to which extent Mauritania considers itself bound by the obligations resulting from the Covenant.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore regards the above-mentioned declaration as a reservation and as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservation made by the Government of Mauritania to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Federal Republic of Germany and Mauritania.

12 September 2007

With regard to the reservation made by Maldives upon accession:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the declaration made by the Government of the Republic of Maldives on 19 September 2006 in respect of Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that reservations which consist in a general reference to a system of norms (like the constitution or the legal order of the reserving State) without specifying the contents thereof leave it uncertain to which extent that State accepts to be bound by the obligations under the treaty. Moreover, those norms may be subject to changes.

The reservation made by the Republic of Maldives is therefore not sufficiently precise to make it possible to determine the restrictions that are introduced into the agreement. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is therefore of the opinion that the reservation is capable of contravening the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore regards the above-mentioned reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of Maldives."

GREECE

11 October 2004

With regard to the declarations made by Turkey upon ratification:

"The Government of Greece has examined the declarations made by the Republic of Turkey upon ratifying the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Republic of Turkey declares that it will implement the provisions of the Covenant only to the States with which it has diplomatic relations.

In the view of the Government of Greece, this declaration in fact amounts to a reservation. This reservation is incompatible with the principle that inter-State reciprocity has no place in the context of human rights treaties, which concern the endowment of individuals with rights. It is therefore contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Republic of Turkey furthermore declares that the Covenant is ratified exclusively with regard to the national territory where the Constitution and the legal and administrative order of the Republic of Turkey are applied.

In the view of the Government of Greece, this declaration in fact amounts to a reservation. This reservation is contrary to the letter and the spirit of article 2 (i) of the Covenant. Indeed, a State Party must respect and ensure the rights laid down in the Covenant to anyone within the power or effective control of that State Party, even if not situated within the territory of such State Party. Accordingly, this reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

For these reasons, the Government of Greece objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Republic of Turkey to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Hellenic Republic and the Republic of Turkey. The Covenant, therefore, enters into force between the two States without the Republic of Turkey benefiting from these reservations."

24 October 2005

With regard to the reservations made by Mauritania upon accession:

"The Government of the Hellenic Republic have examined the reservations made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania upon accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (New York, 16 December 1966) in respect of articles 18 and 23 paragraph 4 thereof.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic consider that these declarations, seeking to limit the scope of the aformentioned provisions on a unilateral basis, amount in fact to reservations.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic furthermore consider that, although these reservations refer to specific provisions of the Covenant, they are of a general character, as they do not clearly define the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations deriving from the Covenant.

For these reasons, the Government of the Hellenic Republic object to the abovementioned reservations made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Greece and Mauritania."

HUNGARY

18 September 2007

With regard to the reservation made by Maldives upon accession:

"The Government of the Republic of Hungary has examined the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives on 19 September 2006 upon accession to the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights of 16 December 1966. The reservation states that the application of the principles set out in Article 18 of the Covenant shall be without prejudice to the Constitution of the Republic of Maldives.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary is of the opinion that the reservation to Article 18 will unavoidably result in a legal situation in respect of the Republic of Maldives, which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Namely the reservation makes it unclear to what extent the Republic of Maldives considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant thus raising concerns as to its commitment to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

According to Article 19 point (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 1969, a State may formulate a reservation unless it is incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservation. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Hungary and the Republic of Maldives."

IRELAND

11 October 2001

With regard to the reservations made by Botswana upon ratification:

"The Government of Ireland have examined the reservations made by the Government of the Republic of Botswana to Article 7 and to Article 12, paragraph 3 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

These reservations invoke provisions of the internal law of the Republic of Botswana. The Government of Ireland are of the view that such reservations may cast doubts on the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. Furthermore, the Government of Ireland are of the view that such reservations may undermine the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of Ireland therefore object to the reservations made by the Government of the Republic of Botswana to Article 7 and Article 12, paragraph 3 of the Covenant.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Ireland and the Republic of Botswana."

19 September 2007

With regard to the reservation made by Maldives upon accession:

"The Government of Ireland notes that the Republic of Maldives subjects application of Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights to the Constitution of the Republic of Maldives.

The Government of Ireland is of the view that a reservation which consists of a general reference to the Constitution of the reserving State and which does not clearly specify the extent of the derogation from the provision of the Covenant may cast doubts on the commitment of the reserving state to fulfil its obligations under the Covenant.

The Government of Ireland is furthermore of the view that such a reservation may undermine the basis of international treaty law and is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Ireland therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Ireland and the Republic of Maldives."

ITALY

5 October 1993

"The Government of Italy, ..., objects to the reservation to art. 6 paragraph 5 which the United States of America included in its instrument of ratification.

In the opinion of Italy reservations to the provisions contained in art. 6 are not permitted, as specified in art.4, para 2, of the Covenant.

Therefore this reservation is null and void since it is incompatible with the object and the purpose of art. 6 of the Covenant.

Furthermore in the interpretation of the Government of Italy, the reservation to art. 7 of the Covenant does not affect obligations assumed by States that are parties to the Covenant on the basis of article 2 of the same Covenant.

These objections do not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Italy and the United States."

LATVIA

15 November 2005

With regard to reservations made by Mauritania upon ratification:

"The Government of the Republic of Latvia has carefully examined the declaration made by Mauritania to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights upon accession.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia considers that the declaration contains general reference to prescriptions of the Islamic Shariah, making the provisions of International Covenant subject to the prescriptions of the Islamic Shariah.

Thus, the Government of the Republic of Latvia is of the opinion that the declaration is in fact a unilateral act deemed to limit the scope of application of the International Covenant and therefore, it shall be regarded as a reservation.

Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Latvia noted that the reservation does not make it clear to what extent Mauritania considers itself bound by the provisions of the International Covenant and whether the way of implementation of the provisions of the International Covenant is in line with the object and purpose of the International Covenant.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia recalls that customary international law as codified by Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, and in particular Article 19c), sets out that reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are not permissible.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by Mauritania to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the International Covenant between the Republic of Latvia and Mauritania. Thus, the International Covenant will become operative without Mauritania benefiting from its reservation."

13 August 2007

With regard to reservation made by Bahrain:

"The Government of the Republic of Latvia has noted that the reservation made by the Kingdom of Bahrain is submitted to the Secretary General on 4 December 2006, but the consent to be bound by the said Covenant by accession is expressed on 20 September 2006. In accordance with Article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties reservations might be made upon signature, ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. Taking into considerations the aforementioned, the Government of the Republic of Latvia considers that the said reservation is not in force since its submission."

4 September 2007

With regard to the reservation made by Maldives upon accession:

"The Government of the Republic of Latvia has carefully examined the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights upon accession.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia considers that the said reservation makes the constitutive provisions of International Covenant subject to the national law (the Constitution) of the Republic of Maldives.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia recalls that customary international law as codified by Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, and in particular Article 19 (c), sets out that reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are not permissible.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia, therefore, objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Republic of Maldives to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the International Covenantbetween the Republic of Latvia and the Republic of Maldives. Thus, the International Covenant will become operative without the Republic of Maldives benefiting from its reservation."

NETHERLANDS

12 June 1980

"In the opinion of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands it follows from the text and the history of the Covenant that [reservation (i) by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago] is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore considers the reservation unacceptable and formally raises an objection to it."

12 January 1981

[See under ***"Objections"*** *in chapter IV.3.]*

17 September 1981

"I. Reservation by Australia regarding articles 2 and 50

The reservation that article 2, paragraphs 2 and 3, and article 50 shall be given effect consistently with and subject to the provisions in article 2, paragraph 2, is acceptable to the Kingdom on the understanding that it will in no way impair Australia's basic obligation under international law, as laid down in article 2, paragraph 1, to respect and to ensure to all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction the rights recognized in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

II. Reservation by Australia regarding article 10

The Kingdom is not able to evaluate the implications of the first part of the reservation regarding article 10 on its merits, since Australia has given no further explanation on the laws and lawful arrangements, as referred to in the text of the reservation. In expectation of further clarification by Australia, the Kingdom for the present reserves the right to raise objection to the reservation at a later stage.

III. Reservation by Australia regarding `Convicted Persons'

The Kingdom finds it difficult, for the same reasons as mentioned in itscommentary on the reservation regarding article 10, to accept the declaration by Australia that it reserves the right not to seek amendment of laws now in force in Australia relating to the rights of persons wo have been convicted of serious criminal offences. The Kingdom expresses the hope it will be possible to gain a more detailed insight in the laws now in force in Australia, in order to facilitate a definitive opinion on the extent of this reservation."

6 November 1984

[Same objection as the one made by Belgium.]

18 March 1991

With regard to interpretative declaration made by Algeria:

*[See under **"Objections"** in chapter IV.3.]*

10 June 1991

"In the opinion of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands it follows from the text and the history of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that the reservations with respect to articles 14, paragraphs 5 and 7 and 22 of the Covenant made by the Government of the Republic of Korea are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore considers the reservation unacceptable and formally raises objection to it. This objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of this Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Republic of Korea."

28 September 1993

With regard to the reservations to articles 6 and 7 made by the United States of America:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations with respect to capital punishment for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age, since it follows from the text and history of the Covenant that the said reservation is incompatible with the text, the object and purpose of article 6 of the Covenant, which according to article 4 lays down the minimum standard for the protection of the right to life.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservation with respect to article 7 of the Covenant, since it follows from the text and the interpretation of this article that the saidreservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

In the opinion of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands this reservation has the same effect as a general derogation from this article, while according to article 4 of the Covenant, no derogations, not even in times of public emergency, are permitted.

It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that the understandings and declarations of the United States do not exclude or modify the legal effect of provisions of the Covenant in their application to the United States, and do not in any way limit the competence of the Human Rights Committee to interpret these provisions in their application to the United States.

Subject to the proviso of article 21, paragraph 3 of the Vienna Convention of the Law of Treaties, these objections do not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the United States."

22 July 1997

With regard to the declarations and the reservation made by Kuwait:

[Same objection identical in essence, mutatis mutandis as the one made for Algeria.]

26 December 1997

With regard to the interpretative declaration concerning article 6 paragraph 5 made by Thailand:

"The Government of theKingdom of the Netherlands considers this declaration as a reservation. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the aforesaid declaration, since it follows from the text and history of the Covenant that the declaration is incompatible with the text, the object and purpose of article 6 of the Covenant, which according to article 4 lays down the minimum standard for the protection of the right to life.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Kingdom of Thailand."

9 October 2001

With regard to the reservations made by Botswana upon ratification:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Government of Botswana upon signature of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and confirmed upon ratification, regarding articles 7 and 12, paragraph 3, of the Covenant. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands notes that the said articles of the Covenant are being made subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of existing legislation in Botswana.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the view that, in the absence of further clarification, these reservations raise doubts as to the commitment of Botswana as to the object and purpose of the Covenant and would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all Parties and that States are preparedto undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Botswana to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Botswana."

31 May 2005

With regard to the reservations made by Mauritania upon accession:

"The Government of the Netherlands has examined the reservation made by Mauritania to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The application of the Articles 18 and 23 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights has been made subject to religious considerations. This makes it unclear to what extent Mauritania considers itself bound by the obligations of the treaty and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of Mauritania to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

It is of the common interest of States that all parties respect treaties to which they have chosen to become parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation which is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted (Art. 19 c).

The Government of the Netherlands therefore objects to the reservation made by Mauritania to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Mauritania and the Kingdom of the Netherlands, without Mauritania benefiting from its reservation."

27 July 2007

With regard to the reservation made by Bahrain:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Since the reservations were made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations were too late and therefore inconsistent with article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Furthermore, the reservation with respect to articles 3, 18 and 23 of the Covenant is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that with this reservation the application of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is made subject to the Islamic Shariah. This makes it unclear to what extent the Kingdom of Bahrain considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty is not permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to all of thereservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain since they were made after accession, and specifically objects to the content of the reservation on articles 3, 18 and 23 made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Kingdom of Bahrain."

27 July 2007

With regard to the reservation made by Maldives upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservation with respect to article 18 of the Covenant is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

Furthermore, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that with this reservation the application of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is made subject to the provisions of constitutional law in force in the Republic of Maldives. This makes it unclear to what extent the Republic of Maldives considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the Republic of Maldives to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty is not permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and expresses the hope that the Republic of Maldives will soon be able to withdraw its reservation in light of the ongoing process of a revision of the Maldivian Constitution.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Republic of Maldives."

NORWAY

4 October 1993

With regard to reservations to articles 6 and 7 made by the United States of America:

"1. In the view of the Government of Norway, the reservation (2) concerning capital punishment for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age is according to the text and history of the Covenant, incompatible with the object and purpose of article 6 of the Covenant. According to article 4 (2), no derogations from article 6 may be made, not even in times of public emergency. For these reasons the Government of Norway objects to this reservation.

2. In the view of the Government of Norway, the reservation (3) concerning article 7 of the Covenant is according to the text and interpretation of this article incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. According to article 4 (2), article 7 is a non-derogable provision, even in times of public emergency. For these reasons, the Government of Norway objects to this reservation.

The Government of Norway does not consider this objection to constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Norway and the United States of America."

22 July 1997

With regard to the declarations and the reservation made by Kuwait :

"In the view of the Government of Norway, a statement by which a State Party purports to limit its responsibilities by invoking general principles of internal law may create doubts about the commitment of the reserving State to the objective and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. Under well-established treaty law, a State is not permitted to invoke internal law as justification for its failure to perform its treaty obligations. Furthermore, the Government of Norway finds the reservations made to article 8, paragraph 1 (d) and article 9 as being problematic in view of the object and purpose of the Covenant. For these reasons, the Government of Norway objects to the said reservations made by the Government of Kuwait.

The Government of Norway does not consider this objection to preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of Norway and the State of Kuwait."

11 October 2001

With regard to the reservation made by Botswana upon ratification :

"The Government of Norway has examined the contents of the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Botswana upon ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The reservation's reference to the national Constitution without further description of its contents, exempts the other States Parties to the Covenant from the possibility of assessing the effects of the reservation. In addition, as the reservation concerns two of the core provisions of the Covenant, it is the position of the Government of Norway that the reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant. Norway therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of Botswana.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Covenant between the Kingdom of Norway and the Republic of Botswana. The Covenant thus becomes operative between Norway and Botswana without Botswana benefiting from the said reservation."

PAKISTAN

With regard to the declaration made by India upon accession:

"The Government of Islamic Republic of Pakistan objects to the declaration made by the Republic of India in respect of article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The right of Self-determination as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and as embodied in the Covenants applies to all peoples under foreign occupation and alien domination.

The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan cannot consider as valid any interpretation of the right of self-determination which is contrary to the clear language of the provisions in question. Moreover, the said reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenants. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and India without India benefiting from its reservations."

POLAND

22 November 2005

With regard to reservations made by Mauritania upon ratification:

"The Government of the Republic of Poland has examined the Declaration made by Mauritania upon accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, done in New York on 16 December 1966, hereinafter called the Covenant, in respect of Articles 18 and 23 (4).

The Government of the Republic of Poland considers that the Declaration made Mauritania - which constitutes de facto a reservation - is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant which guarantees every person equal enjoyment of the rights set forth in the Covenant.

The Government of the Republic of Poland therefore considers that, according to the customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, done at Vienna on 23 May 1969, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted (Article 19 c).

Furthermore, the Government of the Republic of Poland considers that the Declaration made by Mauritania is not precise enough to define for the other State Parties the extent to which Mauritania has accepted the obligation of the Covenant.

The Government of the Republic of Poland therefore objects to Declaration made by Mauritania.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Poland and Mauritania."

PORTUGAL

26 October 1990

[See under ***"Objections"*** *in chapter IV.3.]*

5 October 1993

With regard to the reservations made by the United States of America:

"The Government of Portugal considers that the reservation made by the United States of America referring to article 6, paragraph 5 of the Covenant which prohibits capital punishment for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age is in compatible with article 6 which, as made clear by paragraph 2 of article 4, lays down the minimum standard for the protection of the right to life.

The Government of Portugal also considers that the reservation with regard to article 7 in which a State limits its responsibilities under the Covenant by invoking general principles of National Law may create doubts on the commitments of the Reserving State to the object and purpose of the Covenant and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of International Law.

The Government of Portugal therefore objects to the reservations made by the United States of America. These objections shall not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Portugal and the United States of America."

26 July 2001

With regard to the reservation to article 7 made by Botswana upon ratification:

"The Government of the Portuguese Republic has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Botswana to article 7 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (New York, 16 December 1966).

The Government of the Portuguese Republic is of the view that, according to article 4 (2) of the Covenant, the said reservation is incompatible with its object and purpose.

Furthermore, this reservation goes against the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a State party to a treaty may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform according tothe obligations set out by the said treaty. It is the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic considers that the Government of the Republic of Botswana, by limiting its responsibilities under the Covenant by invoking general principles of its Constitutional Law, may create doubts on its commitment to the Covenant and, moreover, contribute to undermine the basis of International Law.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Botswana to article 7 of the Covenant. This objection shall not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between the Portuguese Republic and the Republic of Botswana."

13 October 2004

With regard to declarations and the reservation made by Turkey upon ratification:

"The Government of Portugal considers that reservations by which a State limits its responsibilities under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) by invoking certain provisions of national law in general terms may create doubts as to the commitment of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international law.

It is in the common interest of all States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Portugal therefore objects to the reservation by Turkey to the ICCPR. This objection shall not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Portugal and Turkey."

21 November 2005

With regard to reservations made by Mauritania upon ratification:

"Portugal considers that the declaration concerning both Article 18 and Article 23, paragraph 4 is a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Covenant on a unilateral basis and that is not authorised by the Covenant.

This reservation creates doubts as to the commitment of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contributes to undermining the basis of international law.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic, therefore, objects to the above reservation made by the Mauritanian Government to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Portugal and Mauritania."

29 August 2007

With regard to the reservation made by Maldives upon accession:

"The Government of the Portuguese Republic has carefully examined the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).

According to the reservation, the application of the principles set out in Article 18 of the Covenant shall be without prejudice to the Constitution of the Republic of Maldives. Portugal considers that this article is a fundamental provision of the Covenant and the reservation makes it unclear to what extent the Republic of Maldives considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant, raises concerns as to its commitment to the object and purpose of the Covenant and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international law.

It is in the common interest of all States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties. The Government of the Portuguese Republic, therefore, objects to the above mentioned reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to the ICCPR. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Portugal and the Maldives."

SLOVAKIA[7,15,27]

SPAIN

5 October 1993

With regard to the reservations made by the United States of America:

... After careful consideration of the reservations made by the United States of America, Spain wishes to point out that pursuant to article 4, paragraph 2, of the Covenant, a State Party may not derogate from several basic articles, among them articles 6 and 7, including in time of public emergency which threatens the life of the nation.

The Government of Spain takes the view that reservation (2) of the United States having regard to capital punishment for crimes committed by individuals under 18 years of age, in addition to reservation (3) having regard to article 7, constitute general derogations from articles 6 and 7, whereas, according to article 4, paragraph 2, of the Covenant, such derogations are not to be permitted.

Therefore, and bearing in mind that articles 6 and 7 protect two of the most fundamental rights embodied in the Covenant, the Government of Spain considers that these reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and, consequently, objects to them.

This position does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of Spain and the United States of America.

9 October 2001

With regard to the reservation to article 7 made by Botswana upon ratification:

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has examined the reservation made on 16 December 2000 by the Government of the Republic of Botswana to article 7 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which makes its adherence to that article conditional by referring to the current content of Botswana's domestic legislation.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that this reservation, by referring to domestic law, affects one of the fundamental rights enshrined in the Covenant (prohibition of torture, right to physical integrity), from which no derogation is permitted under article 4, paragraph 2, of the Covenant. The Government of Spain also considers that the presentation of a reservation referring to domestic legislation, in the absence of further clarifications, raises doubts as to the degree of commitment assumed by the Republic of Botswana in becoming a party to the Covenant.

Accordingly, the Government of the Kingdom of Spain objects to the above-mentioned reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Botswana to article 7 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 1966.

This objection does not prevent the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of Spain and the Republic of Botswana.

17 September 2007

With regard to the reservation made by Maldives upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has reviewed the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives on 19 September 2006, at the time of its accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 16 December 1966.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain observes that the broad formulation of the reservation, which makes the application of article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights conditional on its conformity with the Constitution of Maldives without specifying the content thereof, renders it impossible to ascertain to what extent the Republic of Maldives has accepted the obligations arising from that provision of the Covenant and, in consequence, raises doubts about its commitment to the object and purpose of the treaty.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers the reservation of the Republic of Maldives to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain recalls that, under customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are not permitted.

Accordingly, the Government of Spain objects to the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection does not prevent the entry into force of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights between the Kingdom of Spain and the Republic of Maldives."

SWEDEN

18 June 1993

With regard to interpretative declarations made by the United States of America:

"... In this context the Government recalls that under international treaty law, the name assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified, does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. Thus, the Government considers that some of the understandings made by the United States in substance constitute reservations to the Covenant.

A reservation by which a State modifies or excludes the application of the most fundamental provisions of the Covenant, or limits its responsibilities under that treaty by invoking general principles of national law, may cast doubts upon the commitment of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the Covenant. The reservations made by the United States of America include both reservations to essential and non-derogable provisions, and general references to national legislation. Reservations of this nature contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. All States Parties share a common interest in the respect for the object and purpose of the treaty to which they have chosen to become parties.

Sweden therefore objects to the reservations made by the United States to:

- article 2; cf. Understanding (1);
- article 4; cf. Understanding (1);
- article 6; cf. Reservation (2);
- article 7; cf. Reservation (3);
- article 15; cf. Reservation (4);
- article 24; cf. Understanding (1).

This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Sweden and the United States of America."

23 July 1997

With regard to the declarations and the reservation made by Kuwait:

"The Government of Sweden notes that the interpretative declarations regarding article 2, paragraph 1, article 3 and 23 imply that central provisions of the Covenant are being made subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of national law. The Government of Sweden further notes that the reservation concerning article 25 (b) is contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Sweden is of the view that these interpretative declarations and this reservation raise doubts as to the commitment of Kuwait to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties, and that states are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid interpretative declarations and reservation made by the Government of Kuwait upon accession to the [said Covenant].

This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Covenant between Kuwait and Sweden."

25 July 2001

With regard to the reservation made by Botswana upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by Botswana upon signature of the 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and confirmed upon ratification, regarding articles 7 and 12 (3) of the Covenant.

The Government of Sweden notes that the said articles of the Covenant are being made subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of existing legislation in Botswana.

The Government of Sweden is of the view that, in the absence of further clarification, this reservation raises doubts as to the commitment of Botswana to the object and purpose of the Covenant and would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted,

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Botswana to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Botswana and Sweden. The Covenant enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Botswana benefiting from its reservation."

30 June 2004

With regard to the declarations and reservation made by Turkey upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Government of Sweden has examined the declarations and reservation made by the Republic of Turkey upon ratifying the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Republic of Turkey declares that it will implement the provisions of the Covenant only to the State parties with which it has diplomatic relations. This statement in fact amounts, in the view of the Government of Sweden, to a reservation. The reservation of the Republic of Turkey makes it unclear to what extent the Republic of Turkey considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant. In absence of further clarification, therefore, the reservation raises doubt as to the commitment of the Republic of Turkey to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Republic of Turkey furthermore declares that the Covenant is ratified exclusively with regard to the national territory where the Constitution and the legal and administrative order of the Republic of Turkey are applied. This statement also amounts, in the view of the Government of Sweden, to a reservation. It should be recalled that the duty to respect and ensure the rights recognized in the Covenant is mandatory upon State parties in relation to all individuals under their jurisdiction. A limitation to the national territory is contrary to the obligations of State parties in this regard and therefore incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Sweden notes that the interpretation and application of article 27 of the Covenant is being made subject to a general reservation referring to the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey and the Treaty of Lausanne of 24 July 1923 and its Appendixes. The general reference to the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey, which, in the absence of further clarification, does not clearly specify the extent of the Republic of Turkey's derogation from the provision in question, raises serious doubts as to the commitment of the Republic of Turkey to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Sweden furthermore wishes to recall that the rights of persons belonging to minorities in accordance with article 27 of the Covenant are to be respected without discrimination. As has been laid down by the Human Rights Committee in its General comment 23 on Article 27 of the Covenant, the existence of a minority does not depend upon a decision by the state but requires to be established by objective criteria. The subjugation of the application of article 27 to the rules and provisions of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey and the Treaty of Lausanne and its Appendixes is, therefore, in the view of the Government of Sweden, incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

According to established customary law as codified by the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of all States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Republic of Turkey to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Turkey and Sweden. The Covenant enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without the Republic of Turkey benefiting from its reservations.

5 October 2005

With regard to the reservations made by the Mauritania upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the declarations made by the Government of Mauritania upon accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, regarding Article 18 and paragraph 4 of Article 23.

The Government of Sweden would like to recall that the designation assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. The Government of Sweden considers that this declaration made by the Government of Mauritania in substance constitutes a reservation.

The reservations make general references to the Islamic Sharia. The Government of Sweden is of the view that the reservations which do not clearly specify the extent of Mauritania's derogation from the provisions in question raises serious doubts as to the commitment of Mauritania to the object and purpose of the Covenant. In addition, article 18 of the Covenant is among the provisions from which no derogation is allowed, according to article 4 of the Covenant.

The Government of Sweden wishes to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that all parties respect treaties to which they have chosen to become parties as to their object and purpose, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Mauritania to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and considers the reservation null and void. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Mauritania and Sweden. The Covenant enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Mauritania benefiting from its reservation."

18 September 2007

With regard to the reservation made by Maldives upon accession:

"...the Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Maldives on 19 September 2006 to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of Sweden notes that the Maldives gives precedence to its Constitution over the application of article 18 of the Covenant. The Government of Sweden is of the view that this reservation, which does not clearly specify the extent of the Maldives' derogation from the provision in question, raises serious doubt as to the commitment of the Maldives to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

According to international customary law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of all States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties, are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and considers the reservation null and void. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Maldives and Sweden. The Covenant enters into force in its entirety between the Maldives and Sweden, without the Maldives benefiting from its reservation."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

24 May 1991

With regard to the reservations made by the Republic of Korea upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom have noted the statement formulated by the Government of the Republic of Korea on accession, under the title "Reservations". They are not however able to take a position on these purported reservations in the absence of a sufficient indication of their intended effect, in accordance with the terms of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and the practice of the Parties to the Covenant. Pending receipt of such indication, the Government of the United Kingdom reserve their rights under the Covenant in their entirety."

17 August 2005

With regard to the declarations made by Mauritania upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom have examined the Declaration made by the Government of Mauritania to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (done at New York on 16 December 1966) on 17 November 2004 in respect of Articles 18 and 23 (4).

The Government of the United Kingdom consider that the Government of Mauritania's declaration that:

'The Mauritanian Government, while accepting the provisions set out in article 18 concerning freedom of thought, conscience and religion, declares that their application shall be without prejudice to the Islamic Shariah. ...

The Mauritanian Government interprets the provisions of article 23, paragraph 4, on the rights and responsibilities of spouses as to marriage as not affecting in any way the prescriptions of the Islamic Shariah' is a reservation which seeks to limit the scope of the Covenant on a unilateral basis. The Government of the United Kingdom note that the Mauritanian reservation specifies particular provisions of the Convention Articles to which the reservation is addressed. Nevertheless this reservation does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving Sta has accepted the obligations of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Mauritania.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Mauritania."

6 September 2007

With regard to the reservation made by Maldives upon accession:

"The Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General and has the honour to refer to the reservation made by the Government of the Maldives to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which reads:

'The application of the principles set out in Article 18 [freedom of thought, conscience and religion] of the Covenant shall be without prejudice to the Constitution of the Republic of the Maldives.'

In the view of the United Kingdom a reservation should clearly define for the other States Parties to the Covenant the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Covenant. A reservation which consists of a general reference to a constitutional provision without specifying its implications does not do so. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the reservation made by the Government of the Maldives.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the United Kingdom and the Maldives."

Declarations recognizing the competence of the Human Rights Committee under article 41[36]

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ALGERIA

[The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Algeria] recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

ARGENTINA

The instrument contains a declaration under article 41 of the Covenant by which the Government of Argentina recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee established by virtue of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

AUSTRALIA

28 January 1993

"The Government of Australia declares that it recognizes, for and on behalf of Australia, the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the aforesaid Convention."

AUSTRIA

10 September 1978

[The Government of the Republic of Austria] declares under article 41 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that Austria recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

BELARUS

30 September 1992

The Republic of Belarus declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee on Human Rights in accordance with article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

BELGIUM

5 March 1987

The Kingdom of Belgium declares that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

18 June 1987

The Kingdom of Belgium declares, under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee established under article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party, provided that such State Party has, not less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a communication relating to Belgium, made a declaration under article 41 recognizing the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications relating to itself.

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

"The Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina in accordance with article 41 of the said Covenant, recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

BULGARIA

12 May 1993

"The Republic of Bulgaria declares that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party which has made a declaration recognizing in regard to itself the competence of the Committee claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

Canada

29 October 1979

"The Government of Canada declares, under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the said Covenant to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party, provided that such State Party has, not less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a communication relating to Canada, made a declaration under article 41 recognizing the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications relating to itself."

Chile

7 September 1990

As from the date of this instrument, the Government of Chile recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee established under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, in accordance with article 41 thereof, with regard to all actions which may have been initiated since 11 March 1990.

Congo

6 July 1989

Pursuant to article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Congolese Government recognizes, with effect from today's date, the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State party is not fulfilling its obligations under the above-mentioned Covenant.

Croatia

12 October 1995

The Government of the Republic of Croatia declares under article 41 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that the Republic of Croatia recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

Czech Republic[7]

Denmark[37]

19 April 1983

"[The Government of Denmark] recognizes, in accordance with article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, opened for signature in New York on December 19, 1966, the competence of the Committee referred to in article 41 to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

Ecuador

6 August 1984

The Government of Ecuador recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the aforementioned Covenant, as provided for in paragraph 1 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) and (h) of that article.

This recognition of competence is effective for an indefinite period and is subject to the provisions of article 41, paragraph 2, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

Finland

"Finland declares, under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the said Covenant, to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Covenant."

Gambia

9 June 1988

"The Government of the Gambia hereby declares that the Gambia recognises the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the present Covenant."

Germany[10,38]

27 December 2001

The Federal Republic of Germany now recognizes for an unlimited period the competence of the Human Rights Committee under Article 41(1) of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that at State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

Ghana

7 September 2000

"The Government of the Republic of Ghana recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to consider complaints brought by or against the Republic in respect of another State Party which has made a Declaration recognising the competence of the Committee at least twelve months before Ghana becomes officially registered as Party to the Covenant.

[The Government of the Republic of Ghana] interprets Article 41 as giving the Human Rights Committee the competence to receive and consider complaints in respect of violations by the Republic of any rights set forth in the said Covenant which result from decisions, acts, commissions, developments or events occurring AFTER the date on which Ghana becomes officially regarded as party to the said Covenant and shall not apply to decisions, acts, omissions, developments or events occurring before that date."

Guyana

10 May 1993

"The Government of the Co-operative Republic of Guyana hereby declares that it recognises the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the aforementioned Covenant."

Hungary

7 September 1988

The Hungarian People's Republic [...] recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee established under article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

ICELAND

22 August 1979

"The Government of Iceland [...] recognizes in accordance with article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

IRELAND

"The Government of Ireland hereby declare that in accordance with article 41 they recognise the competence of the Human Rights Committee established under article 28 of the Covenant."

ITALY

15 September 1978

The Italian Republic recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee, elected in accordance with article 28 of the Covenant, to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State party claims that another State party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

LIECHTENSTEIN

"The Principality of Liechtenstein declares under article 41 of the Covenant to recognize the competence of the Human Rights Committee, to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State party claims that another State party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

LUXEMBOURG

18 August 1983

"The Government of Luxembourg recognizes, in accordance with article 41, the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State party claims that another State party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

MALTA

"The Government of Malta declares that under article 41 of this Covenant it recognises the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party, provided that such other State Party has, not less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a communication relating to Malta, made a declaration under article 41 recognising the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications relating to itself."

NETHERLANDS

11 December 1978

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands declares under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

NEW ZEALAND

28 December 1978

"The Government of New Zealand declares under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that it recognises the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications from another State Party which has similarly declared under article 41 its recognition of the Committee's competence in respect to itself except where the declaration by such a state party was made less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a complaint relating to New Zealand."

NORWAY

31 August 1972

"Norway recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant, to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

PERU

9 April 1984

Peru recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, in accordance with article 41 of the said Covenant.

PHILIPPINES

"The Philippine Government, in accordance with article 41 of the said Covenant, recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee set up in the aforesaid Covenant, to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

POLAND

25 September 1990

"The Republic of Poland recognizes, in accordance with article 41, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

[The Government of the Republic of Korea] recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee under article 41 of the Covenant.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

1 October 1991

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that, pursuant to article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party, in respect of situations and events occurring after the adoption of the present declaration, provided that the State Party in question has, not less than 12 months prior to the submission by it of such a communication, recognized in regard to itself the competence of the

Committee, established in article 41, in so far as obligations have been assumed under the Covenant by the USSR and by the State concerned.

SENEGAL

5 January 1981

The Government of Senegal declares, under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the said Covenant to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party, provided that such State Party has, not less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a communication relating to Senegal, made a declaration under article 41 recognizing the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications relating to itself.

SLOVAKIA[7]

SLOVENIA

"[The] Republic of Slovenia, in accordance with article 41 of the said Covenant, recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

SOUTH AFRICA

"The Republic of South Africa declares that it recognises, for the purposes of article 41 of the Covenant, the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under present the Covenant."

SPAIN[39]

11 March 1998

The Government of Spain declares that, under the provisions of article 41 of the [Covenant], it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

SRI LANKA

"The Government of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka declares under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant, from another State Party which has similarly declared under article 41 its recognition of the Committee's competence in respect to itself."

SWEDEN

26 November 1971

"Sweden recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

SWITZERLAND[37]

25 April 1997

The Swiss Government declares, pursuant to article 41 (1) of the [said Covenant], that it shall recognize for a further period of five years, as from 18 September 1997, the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the present Covenant.

TUNISIA

24 June 1993

The Government of the Republic of Tunisia declares that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee established under article 28 of the [said Covenant] ..., to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that the Republic of Tunisia is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

The State Party submitting such communications to the Committee must have made a declaration recognizing in regard to itself the competence of the Committee under article 41 of the [said Covenant].

UKRAINE

28 July 1992

In accordance with article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Ukraine recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that any State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"The Government of the United Kingdom declare under article 41 of this Covenant that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party, provided that such other State Party has, not less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a communication relating to the United Kingdom made a declaration under article 41 recognizing the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications relating to itself."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"The United States declares that it accepts the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications under article 41 in which a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

ZIMBABWE

20 August 1991*

"The Government of the Republic of Zimbabwe recognizes with effect from today's date, the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another state party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant [provided that such State Party has, not less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a communication relating to Zimbabwe, made a declaration under article 41 recognizing the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications relating to itself]." *(*The text between brackets was received at the Secretariat on 27 January 1993.)"*

Notifications under Article 4 (3) of the Covenant (Derogations)

(Taking into account the important number of these declarations, and in order not to increase excessively the number of pages of the present publication, the text of the notifications has in some cases, exceptionally, been abridged. Unless otherwise indicated, when the notification concerns an extension, the said extension affects those articles of the Covenant originally derogated from, and was decided for the same reasons. The date on the right hand, above the notification, is the date of receipt.)

ALGERIA

19 June 1991

In view of public disturbances and the threat of deterioration of the situation [...] a state of siege has been proclaimed, beginning at midnight in the night of 4/5 June 1991, for a period of four months throughout Algerian territory.

The Government of Algeria subsequently specified that these disturbances had been fomented with a view of preventing the general elections to be held on 27 June 1991 and to challenge the ongoing democratic process; and that in view of the insurrectional situation which threatened the stability of the institutions, the security of the people and their property, and the normal operation of the public services, it had been necessary to derogate from the provisions of articles 9 (3), 12 (1), 17, 19 (2) and 21 of the Covenant.

The said state of siege was terminated throughout Algeria on 29 September 1991.

14 February 1992

(Dated 13 February 1992)

In view of the serious threats to public order and the safety of individuals over the past few weeks, the growth of such threats during the month of February 1992 and the dangers of aggravation of the situation, the President of the High State Council, [...], has issued Presidential decree No. 92-44 of 9 February 1992, decreeing a state of emergency, throughout the national territory, with effect from 9 February 1992 at 2000 hours for a duration of twelve months, in accordance with articles 67, 74 and 76 of the Algerian Constitution. *[The Government of Algeria has specified that the articles of the Covenant which are derogated from are articles 9(3), 12, 17 and 21].*

The establishment of the state of emergency, which is aimed essentially at restoring public order, protecting the safety of individuals and public services, does not interfere with the democratic process inasmuch as the exercise of fundamental rights and freedoms continues to be guarantied.

The state of emergency may, however, be lifted ahead of schedule, once the situation which prompted its establishment has been resolved and normal conditions of life in the nation have been restored.

ARGENTINA

7 June 1989

(Dated 7 June 1989)

Proclamation of the state of siege throughout the national territory for a period of 30 days in response to events [attacks and looting of retail shops, vandalism, use of firearms] whose seriousness jeopardizes the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms by the entire community. (Derogation from articles 9 and 21.)

12 July 1989

(Dated 11 July 1989)

Termination of the state of siege as from 27 June 1989 throughout the national territory.

26 December 2001

(Dated 21 December 2001)

By decree No. 1678/2001 of 19 December 2001, proclamation of a State of siege for 30 days in the territory of Argentina.

By decree No. 1689/2001 of 21 December 2001, suspension of the State of seige declared by Decree No. 1678/2001.

(Dated 23 December 2001)

By Decrees Nos. 16, 18 and 20/2001 of 21 December 2001, declaration of a 10-day siege in the provinces of Buenos Aires, Entre Rios and San Juan.

4 January 2002

(Dated 4 January 2002)

Cessation, as from 31 December 2001, of martial law that had been imposed in the provinces of Buenos Aires, Entre Rios and San Juan.

21 January 2002

(Dated 18 January 2002)

Communication concerning the state of siege declared by Decree No. 1678/2001 and the lifting of the state of siege by Decreee No. 1689/2001; and the state of siege declared by Decrees Nos. 16/2002, 18/2001 and 20/2001 and the cessation of the state of siege. [For the text of the communication, see depositary notification C.N.179.2002.TREATIES-3 of 27 February 2002.]

ARMENIA

6 March 2008

..., in connection with the Decree of the President of the Republic of Armenia on Declaration of the State of Emergency in conformity with Article 55 paragraph 14 and Article 117 paragraph 6 of the Constitution of the Republic of Armenia,, dated 1 March 2008, and pursuant to Article 4 paragraph 3 of the Covenant, availed itself of the right of derogation from or limitation of application of the following provisions of the Covenant: Article 12 paragraph 1; Article 17 paragraph 1; Article 19 paragraphs 1-2; Article 21; Article 22 paragraph 1.

The above decree extends the state of emergency to the city of Yerevan for a period of 20 days in order to prevent the threat of danger to the constitutional order in the Republic of Armenia and protect the rights and legal interests of the population, following the mass disorders, resulting in human losses, personal injury and considerable material damage, which took place in Yerevan on 1 March 2008.

11 March 2008

Amendments in NH-35-N Decree of 1 March 2008

Guided by point 14 of Article 55 and point 6 of Article 117 of the Constitution of the Republic of Armenia, I decree:

- 1. To declare null and void points 6 and 7 of paragraph 4 of the NH-35-N Decree of the President of the Republic of Armenia on Declaration of State of Emergency of 1 March 2008.
- 2. The decree comes into force from the moment of its announcement.

PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA
R. KOCHARIAN

AZERBAIJAN

16 April 1993

Proclamation of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days as from 6 a.m. on 3 April 1993 until 6 a.m. on 3 June 1993 in the territory of the Azerbaijani Republic. The Government of the Azerbaijani Republic declared that the measures were taken as a result of the escalating aggression by the armed forces of Armenia threatening the very existence of the Azerbaijani State.

(Derogation from articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22.)

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 60 days as from 2 August 1993.

27 September 1993

Lifting of the state of emergency proclaimed on 2 April 1993 as from 22 September 1993.

7 October 1994

(Dated 5 October 1994)

Proclamation of a 60 day state of emergency in Baku by Decree of the President of 4 October 1994 with effect from 20 hours on 4 October 1994 owing to the fact that in September 1994, terrorist groups wounded two prominent Azerbaijani politicians followed by a series of terrorist acts in densely populated districts of the city which caused loss of life. These acts, designed to destabilize the social and political situation in the country were preliminary to the subsequent direct attempt to overthrow by force of arms the constitutional order of the Azerbaijani Republic and the country's democratically elected leader.

The Government of Azerbaijan specifed that the rights set forth in articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant were derogated from.

27 October 1994

(Dated 21 October 1994)

Declaration of a state of emergency in the city of Gyanja for a period of 60 days as from 11 October 1994 by Decree of the President of the Azerbaijani Republic dated 10 October 1994 following an attempted *coup d'état* in Gyanja since on 4 October 1994, control of the organs of State was seized by criminal groups and acts of violence were perpetrated against the civilian population. This action was the latest in a series of terrorist acts designed to destabilizethe situation in Baku. A number of the criminals involved in the insurrection are continuing their activities directed against the state system of Azerbaijan and are endeavouring to disrupt public order in the city of Gyanja.

It was specified that the rights set forth in articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant were derogated from.

15 December 1994

(Dated 13 December 1994)

Extension of the state of emergency in Baku, as from 2000 hours on 4 December 1994 in view of the incomplete elimination of the causes that served as the basis for its imposition.

20 December 1994

(Dated 17 December 1994)

Extension of the state of emergency in the town of Gyandzha for a period of 60 days as from 2400 hours on 11 December 1994 in view of the incomplete elimination of the causes that served as the basis for its imposition.

23 February 1995

(Dated 23 February 1995)

First notification:

By Decree by the President of the Republic dated 2 February 1995, extension of the state of emergency in Baku, for a period of 60 days, as from 2300 hours on 2 February 1995.

Second notification:

By Decree by the President of the Republic dated 2 February 1995 on the extension of the state of emergency in the town of Gyandzha, for a period of 60 days, as from 2400 hours on 9 February 1995.

The extension of the state of emergency in Baku and Gyandzha has been declared, as indicated by the Government of Azerbaijan, bearing in mind the need to maintain social order, to protect the rights and freedoms of citizens and to restore legality and law and order and in view of the incomplete elimination of the causes that served as the basis for the imposition in October 1994 of the state of emergency in the cities of Baku and Gyandzha.

It is recalled that the provisions from which it has been derogated are articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant.

17 April 1995

(Dated 8 April 1995)

Extension of the state of emergency in Baku fora period of 60 days, by Decree of the President of the Republic dated 2 April 1995 as from 2000 hours on 3 April 1995. The extension of the state of emergency in Baku has been declared, as indicated by the Government of Azerbaijan, due to an attempted *coup d'état* which took place on 13-17 March 1995 in the city of Baku and to the fact that notwithstanding the suppression of the rebellion, criminal elements in the city of Baku are continuing activities inconsistent with the will of the people and endeavouring to disrupt public order. The Government of Azerbaijan also confirmed that the extension was decided in order to protect the constitutional order of the country, to maintain public order in the city of Baku, to protect the rights and freedoms of citizens and to restore legality and law and order.

21 April 1995

(Dated 17 April 1995)

Termination, as from 11 April 1995, on the basis of a decision of the Milli Mejlis (Parliament) of the Azerbaijani Republic dated 11 April 1995, of the State of emergency in the city of Gyanja declared on 11 October 1994.

BOLIVIA

1 October 1985

By Supreme Decree No. 21069, the Government of Bolivia declared a temporary state of siege throughout the country, with effect from 18 September 1985.

The notification specifies that this measure was adopted to ensure the maintenance of the process of economic recovery initiated by the Government so as to save Bolivia from the scourge of hyperinflation and to counter the social unrest which sought to supplant the legitimate authorities by establishing itself as an authority which publicly proclaimed the repudiation of the law and called for subversion, and to counter the occupation of State facilities and the interruption of public services. The Government of Bolivia has specified that the provisions of the Covenant from which it is derogated from concern articles 9, 12 and 21.

9 January 1986

(Dated 6 January 1986)

... The guarantees and rights of citizens had been fully restored throughout the national territory, with effect from 19 December 1985 and, accordingly, the provisions of the Covenant were again being implemented in accordance with the stipulations of its relevant articles.

29 August 1986

(Dated 28 August 1986)

The notification indicates that the state of emergency was proclaimed because of serious political and social disturbances, *inter alia* , a general strike in Potosi and Druro which paralyzed illegally those cities; the hyperinflationary crisis suffered by the country; the need for rehabilitation of the Bolivian mining structures; the subversive activities of the extreme left; the desperate reaction of the drug trafficking mafia in response to the government successful campaign of eradication; and in general plans aiming to overthrow the Constitutional Government.

28 November 1986

(Dated 28 November 1986)

Notification, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis* , as that of 9 January 1986. With effect from 29 November 1986.

17 November 1989

(Dated6 November 1989)

Proclamation of a state of siege throughout the Bolivian territory. The notification indicates that this measure was necessary to restore peace which had been seriously breached owing to demands of an economic nature, but with a subversive purpose that would have put an end to the process of economic stabilization. The provisions of the Covenant from which it is derogated concern articles 9, 12 and 21 of the Covenant.

22 March 1990

(Dated 18 March 1990)

Termination of the state of emergency as from 15 February 1990.

19 April 1995

(Dated 19 April 1995)

Declaration of a state of siege throughout the nation by Supreme Decree No. 23993 on 18 April 1995 for a period of 90 days.

The reasons for the declaration of this state of siege, as indicated by the Government of Bolivia, were due to the fact that leaders, particularly from the teaching profession and from political groups having close ties to trade union leaders have organized strikes, embargoes and violence against individuals and property, in an effort to bypass existing laws and disrupt the public order and peace in the country. Moreover, assemblies of people openly disregarding the Constitution of the State and the laws have arrogated to themselves the sovereignty of the people, seeking to create bodies outside the supreme law of the national and the other laws.

The articles which were being derogated from were articles 12(3), 21(2) and 22 (2).

26 July 1995

(Dated 26 July 1995)

Extension of the state of siege, declared on 19 April 1995, by Supreme Decree No. 24701 until 15 October 1995.

16 August 1995

(Dated 10 August 1995)

Termination as from 31 July 1995 of the provisional detention of all persons so detained or confined as a result of the proclamation of martial law in Bolivia.

25 October 1995

(Dated 23 October 1995)

Termination, as from 16 October 1995, of the state of siege which had been in force throughout the nation from 18 April 1995.

CHILE

7 September 1976

[Chile] has been under a state of siege for reasons of internal defence since 11 March 1976; the state of siege was legally proclaimed by Legislative Decree No. 1.369.

The proclamation was made in accordance with the constitutional provisions concerning state of siege, which have been in force since 1925, in view of the inescapable duty of the government authorities to preserve public order and the fact that there continue to exist in Chile extremist seditious groups whose aim is to overthrow the established Government.

As a consequence of the proclamation of the state of siege, the rights referred to in articles 9, 12, 13, 19 and 25 (b) of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights have been restricted in Chile.

23 September 1986

(Dated 16 September 1986)

By Decree No. 1.037, the Government of Chile declared a state of siege throughout the national territory from 8 September to 6 December 1986, for as long as circumstances warrant. The notification specifies that Chile has been subjected to a wave of terrorist aggression of alarming proportions, that an alarming number of attacks have taken the lives of a significant number of citizens and armed forces personnel, massive stockpiles of weapons were discovered in terrorists hands, and that for the first time in the history of the Republic, a terrorist attack was launched on H.E. the President of the Republic.

The notification specifies that the rights set forth in articles 9, 12, 13 and 19 of the Covenant would be derogated from.

29 October 1986

(Dated 28 October 1986)

Termination of State of siege by Decree No. 1074 of 26 September 1986 in the Eleventh Region and by Decree No. 1155 of 16 October 1986 in the 12th Region (with the exception of the Commune of Punta Arenas), in the Province of Chiloé in the Tenth Region, and in the Province of Parinacota in the First Region.

20 November 1986

(Dated 20 November 1986)

Termination of the state siege in the Provinces of Cardenal Caro in the 6th Region, Arauco in the 8th Region and Palena in the 10th Region.

29 January 1987

(Dated 20 January 1987)

Termination of the state of siege throughout Chile as at 6 January 1987.

31 August 1988

Termination of the state of emergency and of the state of danger of disturbance of the domestic peace in Chile as from 27 August 1988, [...] thereby bringing to an end all states of ex ception in the country, which is now in a situation of full legal normality.

COLOMBIA

18 July 1980

The Government, by Decree 2131 of 1976, declared that public order had been disturbed and that all of the national territory was in a state of siege, the requirements of the Constitution having been fulfilled, and that in the face of serious events that disturbed the public peace, it had become necessary to adopt extraordinary measures within the framework of the legal régime provided for in the National Constitution for such situations (art. 121 of the National Constitution). The events disturbing the public peace that led the President of the Republic to take that decision are a matter of public knowledge. Under the state of siege (art. 121 of the National Constitution) the Government is empowered to suspend, for the duration of the state of siege, those provisions that are incompatible with the maintenance and restoration of public order.

On many occasions the President of the Republic has informed the country of his desire to terminate the state of siege when the necessary circumstances prevail.

It should be observed that, during the state of siege in Colombia, the institutional order has remained unchanged, with the Congress and all public bodies functioning normally. Public freedoms were fully respected during the most recent elections, both the election of the President of the Republic and the election of members of elective bodies.

11 October 1982

By Decree No. 1674 of 9 June 1982, the state of siege was terminated on 20 June of 1982.

11 April 1984

(Dated 30 March 1984)

The Government of Colombia had declared a breach of the peace and a state of siege in the territory of the

Departments of Caquetá, Huila, Meta and Cauca in response to the activities in those Departments of armed groups which wereseeking to undermine the constitutional system by means of repeated publidisturbances.

Further to Decree No. 615, Decree Nos. 666, 667, 668, 669 and 670 had been enacted on 21 March 1984 to restrict certainreedoms and to take other measures aimed at restoring public order. (For the provisions which were derogated from, see *in fine* notification of 8 June 1984 hereinafter.)

8 June 1984

(Dated 7 May 1984)

The Government of Colombia indicated that it had, through Decree No. 1038 of 1 May 1984, declared a state of siege in the territory of the Republic of Colombia owing to the assassination in April of the Minister of Justice and to recent disturbances of the public order that occurred in the cities of Bogotá, Cali, Barranquilla, Medellín, Acevedo (Department of Huila), Corinto (Department of Cauca), Sucre and Jordon Bajo (Department of Santander), Giraldo (Department of Antioquia) and Miraflores (Comisaría of Guaviare).

Pursuant to the above-mentioned Decree No. 1038,the Government had issued Decrees Nos. 1039 and 1040 of 1 May 1984 and Decree No. 1042 of 2 May 1984, restricting certain freedoms and enacting other measures to restore public order. The Government of Colombia, in a subsequent communication dated 23 November 1984, indicated that the decrees affected the rights referred to in articles 12 and 21 of the Covenant.)

12 December 1984

(Dated 11 December 1984)

Termination of derogation from article 21.

13 August 1991

(Dated 9 August 1991)

Termination as of 7 July 1991 of the state of siege and of the measures adopted on 1 and 2 May 1984, which were still in force through the national territory.

21 July 1992

(Dated 16 July 1992)

By Legislative Decree No. 1155 of 10 July 1992, which was to remain in force until 16 July 1992, the Government of Colombia declared a state of emergency throughout the national territory.... The state of emergency was proclaimed in order to preserve public order by preventing the cartels responsible for the most serious assaults on public order from evading justice. The prospect of a torrent of releases on parole of persons, many of which "awaiting trial for a wide vari of terrorist activities, ... in addition to the acts perpetrated by the drug-trafficking cartels which might have taken place under the provisions of a newly promulgated Code of Penal Procedure", in disregard of the applicability of special legislation, was causing "serious disturbances of public order".

The provisions of the Pact which were derogated from are articles 12, 17, 21 and 22.

20 November 1992

(Dated 10 November 1992)

By legislative Decree No. 1793 of 8 November 1992 which was to remain in force until 6 February 1993, the Government of Colombia declared a state of emergency throughout the national territory for a period of 90 days.... The state of emergency was due to the fact that "in recent weeks, the public order situation in the country ... has grown significantly worse because of terrorist activities by gorilla organizations and organized crime ... Those criminal groups have also managed to obstruct and evade judicial action because the criminal justice is unable to use military forces as a judicial police organ to gather the necessary evidence".

The provisions of the Pact which were derogated from are articles 12, 17, 21 and 22.

29 March 1993

(Dated 5 March 1993)

In accordance with Legislative Decree No. 261, extension for a period of 90 days from 5 February 1993 until 7 May 1993 of the state of emergencyin effect throughout the national territory. The extension was made necessary due to a continuation of the public order disturbances described above. The provisions of the Pact which were derogated from are articles 12, 17, 21 and 22.

27 May 1994

(Dated 6 May 1994))

By legislative Decree No. 874 of 1 May 1994 which is to remain in force until 10 May 1994, declaration of the state of emergency throughout the national territory for the following reasons:

Since November 1993, there has been a significant increase in the number of investigations carried out by the Procurator-General's Office. It has become necessary to take steps to ensure that the efforts made by the Procurator-General's Office to conclude on-going investigations are not hampered through improper situations such as obstructing an agreement, requesting the postponement of formal proceedings, etc.

The large number of cases in which prior circumstances have prevented characterisation within the stipulated time-limit constitutes an unforeseen situation which is generating social insecurity, public anxiety, a lack of trust in the administration of justice and strengthening of the criminal and guerilla warfare organizations committed to disrupting law and order and destabilizing the institutions of government.

In view of the foregoing, measures must be adopted to ensure that the difficulties that have arisen do not affect institutional stability, national security and civil harmony, a judicial emergency must be declared and consequently, transition measures must be adopted in the area of administration and penal procedure.

8 June 1994

(Dated 27 May 1994)

Termination of the state of civil unrest and extension of the applicability of the provisions relating to the judicial emergency. Pursuant to the Decree No. 874 of 1 May 1994 and in exercise of the powers conferred on the Government under article 213 of the Political Constitution, the Government enacted Legislative Decree No. 875 of 1 May 1994, "by means of which a judicial emergency has been declared and measures have been adopted with regard to penal procedure". Because of the declaration of judicial emergency, it was decided to suspend for two months, in respect of cases involving offences under the jurisdiction of regional and National Court judges, the time-limits established for obtaining release on bail.

By means of Decree No. 951 of 10 May 1994, measures were adopted to strengthen the functioning of the justice system.

The Government of Colombia has specified that the provision from which it has derogated is article 9 (3) of the Covenant.

7 November 1995

(Dated 3 November 1995)

By Decree No. 1900 of 2 November 1995, declaration of a State of internal disturbance throughout the national territory for a period of ninety (90) days. The state of internal disturbance by the National Government is justified by the fact that acts of violence attributed to criminal and terrorist organizations have occurred in difference regions of the country and are seriously and manifestly disturbing public order.

25 March 1996

(Dated 21 March 1996)

First notification:

By Legislative Decree No. 1901 of 2 November, the Government limits or restricts fundamental rights or freedoms laid down in the [said] Covenant.

Second notification:

By Decree No. 205 of 29 January 1996, the state of internal disturbance was extended for 90 calendar days, starting on 31 January 1996.

The Government of Colombia has specified that the provision from which it has derogated are articles 17 and 9 respectively of the Covenant.

7 May 1996

(Dated 21 March 1996)

Pursuant to paragraph 3 of Decree No. 0717 of 18 April 1996, the guarantee set forth in article 12 of the Covenant was to be restricted.

The measure was adopted in connection with Decree No. 1900 of 2 November 1995 whereby the state of internal disturbance was declared throughout the national territory *(see notification of 7 November 1995 above).*

21 June 1996

(Dated 18 June 1996)

First notification:

By Decree No. 777 of 29 April 1996, the state of internal disturbance (proclaimed by Decree No. 1900 of 2 November 1995) was extended for a further period of 90 calendar days, starting on 30 April 1996.

Second notification:

By Decree No. 900 of 22 May 1996, measures were adopted to control the activities of criminal and terrorist organizations in special public-order zones. The provisions of the Pact which were derogated from are articles 9 (1) and 12.

31 July 1996

(Dated 30 July 1996)

By Decree No. 1303 of 25 July 1996, lifting of the state of internal disturbance (proclaimed by Decree No. 1900 of 2 November 1995) and extension of some of the measures instituted by means of Decree No. 1901 of 2 November 1995, Decree No. 208 of 29 January 1996 and Decree No. 777 of 29 April 1996.

13 August 2002

(Dated 12 August 2002)

Transmission of Decree No. 1837 dated 11 August 2002, which declared a state of internal disturbance throughout the national territory, and Decree No. 1838 dated 11 August 2002, which introduced a special tax to meet the necessary expenditure under the country's General Budget to maintain democratic security.

19 November 2002

(Dated 8 November 2002)

Transmisison of Decree No. 2555 dated 8 November 2002, which extended the state of internal disturbance declared by Decree 1837 of 11 August 2002 for ninety (90) calendar days, as from 9 November 2002.

25 February 2003

(Dated 12 February 2003)

Transmission Decree 245 of 5 February 2003, concerning the second extension of the declaration of internal disturbance decreed on 5 February 2003 throughout the national territory.

16 October 2008

..., by Legislative Decree No. 3929 of 9 October 2008, a nationwide state of internal disturbance has been declared for 90 days.

ECUADOR

12 May 1983

The Government declared the extension of the state of emergency as from 20 to 25 October 1982 by Executive Decree No. 1252 of 20 October 1982 and derogation from article 12 (1) owing to serious disorders brought about by the suppression of subsidies, and termination of the state of emergency by Executive Decree No. 1274 of 27 October 1982

20 March 1984

Derogation from articles 9 (1) and (2); 12 (1) and (3); 17; 19 (2) and 21 in the provinces of Napo and Esmeraldas by Executive Decree No. 2511 of 16 March 1984 owing to destruction and sabotage in these areas.

29 March 1984

Termination of the state of emergency by Executive Decree No. 2537 of 27 March 1984.

17 March 1986

(Dated 14 March 1986)

Declaration of the State of emergency in the provinces of Pichincha and Manabi due to the acts of subversion and armed uprising by a high-ranking officer no longer on active service, backed by extremist groups; thereby derogations from articles 12, 21 and 22, it being understood that no Ecuadorian may be exiled or deported outside the capitals of the provinces or to a region other than the one in which he lives.

19 March 1986

(Dated 18 March 1986)

End of State of emergency as from 17 March 1986.

29 October 1987

(Dated 28 October 1987)

Declaration of a state of national emergency throughout the national territory, effective as of 28 October 1987. [Derogation from articles 9 (1) and (2); 12 (1) and (2); 19 (2); and 21.]

The notification states that this measure was made necessary as a result of an illegal call for a national strike which would lead to acts of vandalism, offences against persons and property and would disrupt the peace of the State and the proper exercise of the civic rights of Ecuadorians.

30 October 1987

Termination of the state of emergency throughout the national territory as from 0 hour on 29 October 1987.

3 June 1988

(Dated 1 June 1988)

Declaration of a state of national emergency throughout the national territory, effective as of 9 p.m. on 31 May 1988. [Derogation from articles 9 (1) and (2); 12 (1) and (2); 19 (2); and 21.]

The notification states that this measure is the necessary legal response to the 24 hour strike called for by the United Workers Front, which would result in acts of vandalism, violation of the security of persons and attacks on public and private property.

(Dated 2 June 1988)

Termination of the state of emergency throughout the national territory as from 1 June 1988.

14 January 1999

(Dated 12 January 1999) Declaration of a state of emergency in Guayas province, indicating the the measures were prompted by the serious internal disturbance resulting from the massive crime wave in Guayas Province. Subsequently, the Government of Ecuador specified that the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 12 (1) and 17 (1) of the Covenant.

16 March 1999

(Dated 15 March 1999)

Decree No. 681 by the President of the Republic dated 9 March 1999 by which a state of national emergency was declared and the entire territory of the Republic established as a security zone, as from 9 March 1999.

12 April 1999

(Dated 22 March 1999)

Decree No. 717 by the President of the Republic dated 18 March 1999 by which the state of national emergency declared by Decree No. 681 dated 9 March 1999, was lifted as from 18 March 1999.

10 September 1999

(Dated 27 August 1999)

Decree No. 1041 of 5 July 1999 by thePresident of the Republic, establishing a state of emergency in Ecuador in respect of public and private transport system throughout the country during the month of July 1999;

Decree No. 1070 of 13 July 1999 by the President of the Republic (following the revocation of Decree No. 1041 by the National Congress on 13 July 1999), declaring a state of national emergency and establishing the entire territory of the Republic as a secity zone; and

Decree No. 1088 of 17 July 1999 by the President of the Republic, lifting the state of national emergency and rescinding Decree No. 1070. Subsequently, the Government of Ecuador specified that the provisions from which it had derogated were articles 17 (1), 12 (1), 21 and 22 of the Covenant.

28 December 1999

(Dated 9 December 1999)

Establishment of the State of Emergency in the Guayas Province by Decree No. 1557 of 30 November 1999 by the President of the Republic indicating that the measure was taken in response to the serious internal disturbance which produced a massive crime wave that continues to affect that province. The Decree states that "since the state of emergency declared in the Guayas Province in January 1999 *(see notification of 14 January 1999)* , was ended there has been an increase in criminal activity which as made it clear that extraordinary measures must once again be taken..., it is necessary to attenuate the serious repercussions of the ciminal activity in Guayas Province in order to prevent any change in the normal pattern of civil life...".

Subsequently, on 28 January 2000, the Government of Ecuador specified that the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 12 (1) and 17 (1) of the Covenant.

1 February 2000

(Dated 6 January 2000)

On 5 January 2000, by Executive Decree, the President declared a state of national emergency establishing the entire territory of the Republic as a security zone. This measure was motivated by the serious internal unrest caused by the economic crisis which Ecuador is experiencing.

The Government of Ecuador specifed that the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 12 (1), 17 (1), 21 and 22 (1).

On 21 February 2001, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Ecuador a notification dated 16 February 2001, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting the text of Executive Decree No. 1214 by the President of thec dated 2 February 2001, by which a state of national emergency was declared and the entire territory of the Republic was established as a security zone, as from 2 February 2001. The said Decree stipulates that this measure was adopted to overcome the adverse consequences of the economic crisis affecting Ecuador which has created a situation of serious internal unrest.

The Government of Ecuador specified that the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant.

On 21 February 2001, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Ecuador a notification dated 16 February 2001, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting the text of Executive Decree No. 1228 by the President of the Republic dated 9 February 2001, by which the state of national emergency, declared by Decree No. 1214 of 2 February 2001, was lifted as from 9 March 2001.

17 July 2002

Sir,

In accordance with article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, of which Ecuador is a State Party, and on behalf of the national Government, I am writing to notify you of the declarations of a stateof national emergency this year declared by Dr. Gustavo Noboa Bejarano, President of the Republic, in accordance with the provisions of articles 180 and 181 of the Ecuadorian Constitution in force, and when they were lifted. The details of these declarations follow:

Executive Decree No. 2404 of 26 February 2002 (Official Register No. 525): A state of emergency is declared in Sucumbios and Orellana provinces. The reason for this measure is the serious situation arising out of problems of the Colombian conflict on the frontiers;

Executive Decree No. 2421 of 4 March 2002: The state of emergency in Sucumbios and Orellana provinces is declared over, and accordingly Executive Decree 2404 of 22 February 2002 is abrogated;

Executive Decree No. 2492 of 22 March 2002: State of emergency in Esmeraldas, Guayas Los Ríos, Manabí and El Oroovinces. The reason for this measure is the severe storm on the Ecuadorian coast. The state of emergency was lifted on 22 May pursuant to the legal provision embodied in article 182, paragraph 2, of the Ecuadorian Constitution to the effect that "a decree of a state of emergency shall remain in force for up to a maximum of 60 days";

Executive Decree No. 2625 of 7 May 2002 (Official Register No. 575 of 14 May 2002): State of national emergency in respect of land transport. (This state of emergency has not been lifted but, will last until 7 July, unless the President declares that it is lifted in advance.)

Accept, Sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

(Signed) Dr. Heinz Moeller Freile
Minister for Foreign Affairs

18 August 2005

On 18 August 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Ecuador a notification made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant,notifying of the declaration of a state of emergency in Sucumbios and Orellana Provinces, decreed by the President of the Republic on 17 August 2005, in accordance with the provisions of articles 180 and 181 of the Ecuadorian Constitution in force.

The Government of Ecuador specified that this measure was motivated by the serious internal unrest caused by crime waves in the aforementioned provinces. The declaration of emergency was made by means of Executive Decree No. 426 of 17 August 2005. Moreover, the articles of the Covenant which were derogated from were not indicated.

22 August 2005

On 22 August 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Ecuador notifications made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, notifying of the declaration of a state of emergency in the Canton of Chone, Manabi Province, decreed by the Constitutional President of the Republic on 19 August 2005, in accordance with articles 180 and 181 of the Political Constitution of Ecuador.

The Government of Ecuador specified that this measure was taken in response to serious internal unrest, which has led to a crime wave and to widespread looting in the aforementioned canton. The declaration of emergency was made by means of Executive Decree No. 430 of 19 August 2005. Moreover, the Government of Ecuador specified that during the state of emergency the rights established in article 23, paragraphs 9, 12, 13, 14 and 19, and article 23 of the Political Constitution of the Republic were suspended.

18 April 2006

Declaration of a state of emergency in a number of Ecuadorian provinces, issued on 21 March through Executive Decree No. 1269 which was suspended on 7 April 2006 through Executive Decree No. 1329.

EL SALVADOR

14 November 1983

(Dated 3 November 1983)

The Government has declared an extension for a period of 30 days of the suspension of constitutional guarantees by Legislative Decree No. 329 dated 28 October 1983. The constitutional guarantees have been suspended in accordance with article 175 of the Political Constitution because of disruption of public order. In a complimentary notification dated 23 January 1984 and received on 24 January 1984, the Government of El Salvador specified the following:

1) The provisions of the Covenant from which it is derogated are articles 12 and 19 by Decree No. 329 of 28 August 1983, and article 17 (in respect of interference with correspondence);

2) The constitutional guarantees were first suspended by Decree No. 155 dated 6 March 1980, with further extensions of the suspension for a total of 24 months. Decree No. 155 was modified by Decree No. 999 dated 24 February 1982, which expired on 24 March 1982. By Decree No. 1089 dated 20 April 1982, the Revolutionary Government Junta again suspended the constitutional guarantees. By Legislative Decree No. 7 dated 20 May 1982, the Constituent Assembly extended the suspension for an additional period of 30 days. The said Legislative Decree No. 7 was itself extended several times until the adoption of the above-mentioned Decree No. 329 dated 28 October 1983, which took effect on that date.

3) The reasons for the adoption of the initial suspension decree (No. 155 of 6 March 1980) were the same as for the adoption of the subsequent decrees.

18 June 1984

(Dated 14 June 1984)

By Legislative Decree No. 28 of 27 January 1984, previous measures were amended to the effect that political parties would be permitted to conduct electoral campaigns, and were thus authorized to engage in partisan campaigning and electoral propaganda activities. The said Decree was extended for successive 30-day periods until the promulgation of Decree No. 97 of 17 May 1984, which rescinded theafore-mentioned change which had allowed political parties to conduct electoral campaigns.

The provisions of the Covenant from which it is derogated are articles 12, 19, 17 (in respect of interference with correspondence) and 21 and 22. As regards article 22, the suspension refers to the right of association in general, but does not affect the right to join professional associations (the right to form and join trade unions).

2 August 1985

(Dated 31 July 1985)

[...] the Government of El Salvador has for successive periods extended martial law by the following legislative decrees:

Decrees No. 127 of 21 June 1984, No. 146 of 19 July 1984, No. 175 of 24 August 1984, No. 210 of 18 September 1984, No. 234 of 21 October 1984, No. 261 of 20 November 1984, No. 277 of 14 December 1984, No. 322 of 18 January 1985, No. 335 of 21 February 1985, No. 351 of 14 March 1985, No. 386 of 18 April 1985, No. 10 of 21 May 1985, No. 38 of 13 June 1985, and the most recent, Decree No. 96 of 11 July 1985 which extended the martial law for an additional period of 30 days beyond that date.

The provisions of the Covenant that are thus suspended are those of articles 12, 17 (in respect of interference with correspondence) and 19 (2).

The notification specifies that the reasons for the suspension of constitutional guarantees continue to be those originally indicated, namely: the need to maintain a climate of peace and tranquility, which had been disturbed through the commission of acts designed to create a state of instability and social unrest which affected the economy and the public peace by persons seeking to obstruct the process of structural change, thus seriously disrupting public order.

19 December 1989

(Dated 13 November 1989)

Suspension for a period of 30 days as from 12 November 1990 of various constitutional guarantees. (Derogation from articles 12, 17, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant.)

The notification indicates that this measure became necessary owing the use of terror and violence by the Frente Farabundo Marti to obtain the political authority, in complete disregard of previous elections.

FRANCE

15 November 2005

On 15 November 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of France a notification signed by the Permanent Representative dated 15 November 2005, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, declaring a state of emergency had been established pursuant to the Decree dated 8 November 2005.

12 January 2006

On 12 January 2006, the Secretary-General received from the Government of France a notification declaring the termination of the state of emergency established pursuant to the Decree dated 8 November 2005, with effect from 4 January 2006.

GEORGIA

7 March 2006

Excellency,

In conformity with Article 4 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and Article 15 of the Law on the State of Emergency of Georgia, I have to inform you that the President of Georgia on February 26, 2006 has issued the Decree No. 173 on "State of Emergency in the Khelvachauri district" which has been approved by the Parliament of Georgia on February 28, 2006. The Decree is aimed at preventing further spread throughout Georgia of the H5N1 virus (bird flu) that has been recently detected in the district in question. The restrictions imposed upon by the Decree are fully in line with provisions of Article 21, paragraphs 2 and 3 (on the restrictions related to property rights) and Article 22, paragraph 3 (on the restrictions related to the freedom of movement) and Article 46 (on the restrictions related to constitutional rights and freedoms) of the Constitution of Georgia and respective provisions of the Law on the State of Georgia.

You will be informed in due course when the above Decree is abolished.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Signed) Gela Bezhuashvili

23 March 2006

(Dated 23 March 2006)

"In conformity with Article 4 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and Article 15 of the Law of the State of Emergency of Georgia, I have to inform you that the President of Georgia on March 15, 2006 has issued the Decree No. 199 on "Abolishment of the State of Emergency in the Khelvachauri district", which has been approved by the Parliament of Georgia on March 16, 2006.

According to the above Decree, the Presidential Decree No. 173 of February 26, 2006 "On State of Emergency in the Khelvachauri district" has been declared null and void."

8 November 2007

In conformity with Article 4 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights I would like to inform you that the President of Georgia on November 7, 2007 has issued the Order #621 on "the Decration of the State of Emergency on the entire territory of Georgia"and Decree N.1 "On the measures to be undertaken in connection with the declaration of the state of emergency on the entire territory of Georgia"which will be approved by the Parliament of Georgia within next 48 hours. Introduction of the state of emergency became necessary because of the extreme deterioration of the situation in Tbilisi as a result of the attempted coup d'état and massive disobedience and violent resistance to the law enforcement authorities. Due to the state of emergency, pursuant to Article 73, paragraph 1, subparagraph 'h', and Article 46 paragraph 1 of the Constitution of Georgia and Article 2, paragraph 1 of the Law of Georgia on the State of Emergency, right to receive and disseminate information (Article 24 of the Constitution of Georgia), freedom to assembly and manifestation (Article 25) and right to strike (Article 33) are restricted for the duration of the state of emergency. You will be informed in due course when the above Order and Decree are abolished.

GUATEMALA

23 November 1998

(Dated 20 November 1998)

By Decree No. 1-98 of 31 October 1998, declaration of the state of public disaster throughout the national territory for a period of thirty (30) days, in order to resolve the hazardous situation caused by Hurricane Mitch and to mitigate its effects.

26 July 2001

(Dated 26 July 2001)

By Government Decree No. 2-2001, extension of the state of emergency established by Government Decree No. 1-2001, for an additional 30 days throughout the national territory.

The Government Decree No. 1-2001 was not supplied to the Secretary-General. Moreover, the articles of the Covenant which were derogated from were not indicated.

2 August 2001

(Dated 2 August 2001)

By Government Decree No. 3-2001, establishment of a state of emergency for a period of 30 days in the Department of Totonicapán with immidiate effect. The articles of the Covenant which were derogated from were not indicated.

10 August 2001

(Dated 6 August 2001)

State of emergency declared by Decree No. 3-2001 has been rescinded by Government Decree No. 4-2001 with immediate effect.

14 October 2005

On 14 October 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Guatemala a notification made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, notifying of a derogation from obligations under the Covenant.

The decision was adopted by the Congress of Guatemala on 6 October 2005 in Legislative Decree No. 70-2005, and it entered into force on 10 October 2005. The Decree recognizes a state of national disaster in the affected areas for a period of 30 days.

The Government of Guatemala specified that it has derogated from the provisions relating to the right of liberty of movement and the right of freedom of action, except for the right of persons not to be harassed for their opinions or for acts which do not violate the law. Moreover, the articles of the Covenant which were derogated from were not indicated.

5 September 2006

On 5 September 2006, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Guatemala a notification made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, notifying a declaration of a state of emergency in the municipalities of Concepción Tutuapa, Ixchiguán, San Miguel Ixtahuacán, Tajumulco and Tejuela, in the Department of San Marcos of the Republic of Guatemala.

The State of emergency was declared by Governmental Decree No. 1-2006 of 28 August 2006.

18 September 2006

On 18 September 2006, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Guatemala a communication informing him of Government Decree No. 2-2006 of 31 August 2006, which repeals article 4, paragraph (d), of Government Decree No. 1-2006, which was sent earlier.

9 May 2008

(Dated 7 May 2008)

..., by Government Decree No. 1-2008 of 7 May 2008, a state of emergency has been declared throughout the territory of the Republic of Guatemala.

Government Decree No. 1-2008, which entered into force immediately, will remain in effect for 15 days and will be applicable throughout the national territory. Accordingly, the exercise of the rights and freedoms guaranteed under articles 9, 19, 21, 22 (para. 1) and 22 (para. 2) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights has been restricted.

12 May 2008

On 12 May 2008, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Guatemala a letter dated 8 May 2008 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Guatemala providing information on the state of emergency declared in the Republic of Guatemala by Government Decree No. 1-2008.

27 May 2008

In compliance with article 4, paragraph 3 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Government of Guatemala wishes to inform the Secretary-General that the state of emergency established by Government Decree No. 1-2008 expired on 22 May 2008. Accordingly, the rights and guarantees suspended by this Decree have been restored.

24 June 2008

..., by Government Decree No. 3-2008 the President of the Republic has decreed a state of emergency in the municipality of San Juan Sacatepéquez in the Department of Guatemala. The state of emergency will remain in effect for a period of 15 days from 22 June 2008.

ISRAEL

3 October 1991

"Since its establishment, the State of Israel has been the victim of continuous threats and attacks on its very existence as well as on the life and property of its citizens.

"These have taken the form of threats of war, of actual armed attacks, and campaigns of terrorism resulting in the murder of and injury to human beings.

"In view of the above, the State of Emergency which was proclaimed in May 1948 has remained in force ever since. This situation constitutes a public emergency within the meaning of article 4 (1) of the Covenant.

"The Government of Israel has therefore found it necessary, in accordance with the said article 4, to take measures to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation, for the defence of the State and for the protection of life and property, including the exercise of powers of arrest and detention.

"In so far as any of these measures are inconsistent with article 9 of the Covenant, Israel thereby derogates from its obligations under that provision."

JAMAICA

28 September 2004

On 28 September 2004, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Jamaica a notification dated 28 September 2004, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting a Proclamation declaring a state of emergency in the island. The proclamation shall remain in effect for an initial period of 30 days, unless the Governor-General is advised to repeal it or an extension is granted by the House of Representatives.

22 October 2004

In a note received on 22 October 2004, the Government of Jamaica informed the Secretary-General that during the state of emergency, the provisions from which it may derogate are articles 12, 19, 21 and 22 (2) of the Covenant.

27 October 2004

On 27 October 2004, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Jamaica a notification, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting text of sections 26 (4) - (7) of the Constitution by which the proclamation of a state of public emergency issued by the Governor-General on 10 September 2004 terminated on 8 October 2004.

Furthermore, the Government of Jamaica informed the Secretary-General that the possible derogation from the rights guaranteed by Articles 12, 19, 21 and 22 (2) by Jamiaca ceased on 8 October 2004.

24 August 2007

On 24 August 2007, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Jamaica a notification dated 23 August 2007, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting a proclamation declaring a State of Public Emergency in the Island issued by the Governor on 19 August 2007. The proclamation shall remain in effect for an initial period of 30 days, unless the Governor-General is advised to repeal it.

27 August 2007

In a note received on 27 August 2007, the Government of Jamaica informed the Secretary-General that the State of public emergency issued by the Governor on 19 August 2007 has since been lifted effective Friday 24 August.

NAMIBIA

6 August 1999

(Dated 5 August 1999)

Proclamation No. 23 by the President of the Republic of Namibia, establishing a state of emergency in the Caprivi region for an initial period of thirty (30) days, indicating that the measures were prompted by circumstances arisen in this region causing a public emergency threatening the life of the nation and the constitutional order;

Proclamation No. 24 by the President of the Republic of Namibia, setting out the emergency regulations to the Caprivi region.

14 September 1999

Derogation from articles 9 (2) and 9 (3) of the Covenant.

14 September 1999

(Dated 10 September 1999)

Proclamation No. 27 by the President of the Republic, revoking the declaration of state of emergency and emergency regulations in the Caprivi region promulgated by Proclamations No. 23 of 2 August 1999 and No. 24 of 3 August 1999.

NEPAL

8 March 2002

"..... in view of the serious situation arising out of terrorist attacks perpetrated by the Maoists in various districts, killing several security and civilian personnel and attacking the government installations, a state of emergency has been declared in the entire Kingdom effective from 26 November 2001, in accordance with the Article 115 of the Constitution of the Kingdom of Nepal, 2047 (BS). Accordingly, His Majesty the King, on the recommendation of the Council of Ministers, has suspended the right to freedom of opinion and expression (Article 12.2a), freedom to assemble peacefully without arms (12.2b) and to move throughout the Kingdom (12.2d). Press and publication right (13.1), right against preventive detention (Article 15), right to information (Article 16), right to property (Article 17), right to privacy (Article 22) and right to constitutional remedy (Article 23) have also been suspended. However, the right to the remedy of habeas corpus has not been suspended.

The Permanent Representative also would like to inform the Secretary-General that, while suspending the rights and freedoms, His Majesty's Government has fully observed the provision of Article 4, paragraphs 1 and 2 of the above mentioned Covenant. Accordingly, the rights and freedoms as contained in Articles 6, 7, 8 (1), 11, 15, 16 and 18 of the Covenant, which are also guaranteed by the Constitution of the Kingdom of Nepal, remain in effect."

31 May 2002

"... following the dissolution of the Parliament, which was done in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Constitution of the Kingdom of Nepal - 2047, His Majesty's Government of Nepal has decided to hold the general elections on November 13, 2002 in a free and fair manner. In view of the current security situation in the country prompted by the Maoist insurgency, the Government has also extended the state of emergency by three more months. The Government, however, is committed to liftig the emergency as soon as there is an improvement in the security situation to facilitate free and peaceful general elections.

... in spite of these steps, the Government will stay the course in respect to development programs and socio-economic reforms."

21 November 2002

(Dated 19 November 2002)

"... With reference to [...] note 0076/2002 dated 22 February 2002 and pursuant to clause 3 of Article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights 1966, ... [the Government of Nepal] lifted the state of emergency in the country, effective from 20 August 2002."

16 February 2005

"The Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of Nepal to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and, pursuant to Paragraph 3 of Article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), has the honour to inform him that in view of a grave emergency threatening the sovereignty, integrity and security of the Kingdom of Nepal, His Majesty the King has, in accordance with clause (1) of Article 115 (1) of the Constitution of the Kingdom of Nepal, 1990 (2047), issued an order of a State of Emergency in respect of the whole of the Kingdom of Nepal on 1 February 2005 with immediate effect. As the situation in the country had reached a point where the survival of multiparty democracy and the nation's sovereignty had been seriously threatened and the people of Nepal had to go through a miserable period of time due to untold sufferings brought about by the rise in terrorist activities throughout the country, and as the governments formed during the past few years had not been serious enough about initiating a dialogue with terrorists, His Majesty as the protector of the Constitution and the symbol of national unity, had no alternative but to declare a state of emergency to meet the exigencies in exercise of His State authority and in keeping with the spirit of the Constitution of the Kingdom ofl, 1990 and taking into account Article 27 (3) of the Constitution, to protect and preserve the sovereignty of the Nation. His Majesty the King has also, in accordance with clause (8) of Article 115 of the Constitution, suspended sub-clauses (a) freedom of thought and expression, (b) freedom to assemble peaceably and without arms, and (d) freedom to move and reside in any part of Nepal, of clause (2) of Article 12; clause (1) of Article 13 press and publication right which provides that no news item, article or any other reading material shall be censored; and Article 15: right against private detention; Article 16: right to information; Article 17: right to property; Article 22: right to privacy; and Article 23: and the right to constitutional remedy (with the exception of the right to the remedy of habeus corpus) of the Constitution of the Kingdom of Nepal, 1990 (2047).

The Permanent Mission would further like to inform the Secretary-General that such measures are not inconsistent with Nepal's other obligations under international law and do not involve discrimination solely on the ground of race, colour, sex, language, religion or social origin.

The Permanent Mission would also like to inform the Secretary-General that the non-derogable rights as set forth in Articles 6, 7, 8 (paragraphs 1 and 2), 11, 15, 16 and 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and PoliticalRights, which are guaranteed by the Constitution of the Kingdom of Nepal, 1990, have been kept intact."

29 March 2005

"…. following the declaration of a State of Emergency throughout the Kingdom of Nepal on 1 February 2005, [the Government of Nepal] has derogated itself from the obligations under the articles, mentioned below, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) for a period of the State of Emergency in the country. 1. Derogation from Article 19 of the ICCPR following the suspension of sub-clause (a) of Clause 2 of Article 12, Clause (1) of Article 1and Article 16 of the Constitution (freedom of opinion and expression, right to press and publication and right to information respectively). 2. Derogation from Articles 12.1 and 12.2 of the ICCPR following the suspension of sub-clause (d) of Clause 2 of Article 12 of the Constitution (freedom to move and reside in any part of the Kingdom of Nepal). 3. Derogation from Article 17 of the ICCPR following the suspension of Article 22 of the Constitution (right to privacy). 4. Derogation from Article 2.3 of the ICCPR following the suspension of Article 23 of the Constitution (right to constitutional remedy except the writ of habeas corpus)."

5 May 2005

On 5 May 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Nepal a notification, dated the same, informing him that, as required by Article 4 (3) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966, that *His Majesty the King* has, in accordance with clause (11) of Article 115 of the Constitution of the Kingdom of Nepal, 1990 (2047), revoked the Order of State of Emergency proclaimed on 1 Feburary 2005 in respect to fthe whole of the Kingdom of Nepal.

NICARAGUA

4 June 1980

The Governing Junta for National Reconstruction of the Republic of Nicaragua, by Decree No. 383 of 29 April 1980, rescinded the National Emergency Act promulgated on 22 July 1979 and revoked the state of emergency extended by Decree No. 365 of 11 April 1980.

14 April 1982

Suspension of articles 1-5, 8 (3), 10, 12-14, 17, 19-22, 26 and 27 in accordance with Decree No. 996 of 15 March 1982 (national emergency) from 15 March to 14 April 1982. Extension of the suspension to 14 May 1982.

8 June 1982

Extension of the suspension to 14 June 1982.

26 August 1982

Suspension of the above-mentioned articles of the Covenant in accordance with Decree No. 1082 of 26 July 1982 from 26 July 1982 to 26 January 1983.

14 December 1982

Extension of the suspension to 30 May 1983.

8 June 1984

Extension of the state of emergency for fifty days beginning on 31 May 1984 and derogation from article 2, paragraph 3; articles 9, 12 and 14; article 19, paragraphs 2 and 3; and article 21 of the Covenant.

1 August 1984

(Dated 10 June 1984)

Extension of the state of emergency until 30 May 1984 by Decree 1255 of 26 May 1984 and derogations from articles 1 to 5, article 8, paragraph 3; articles 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 19 to 22; and articles 26 and 27.

22 August 1984

(Dated 2 August 1984)

Extension of the state of emergency until 20 October 1984 and derogation from articles 2 (3), 9 and 14 of the Covenant by Legislative Decree No. 1477 of 19 July 1984.

(Dated 9 August 1984)

Derogation from the implementation of articles 2 (3), 9 and 14 of the Covenant from 6 August to 20 October 1984, in respect of persons committing or suspected of committing the offences referred to in articles 1 and 2 of the Act concerning the Maintenance of Order and Public Security.

13 November 1985

(Dated 11 November 1985)

... [The] Government [of Nicaragua] has been obliged, as a resultf the foreign aggression to which it is being subjected, to suspend the application of certain of the provisions of the Covenant throughout the national territory, for a period of one year starting on 30 October 1985.

The reasons for this suspension are [the following]: the Government of the United States of America, against the express will of the majority of the world's governments and peoples and in violation of the norms of international law, has continued its unjust, unlawful and immoral aggression against the Nicaraguan people and their revolutionary government.

... The following provisions of the Covenant [are suspended] throughout the national territory for the period of one year, starting on 29 October 1985:

Article 8 (3); article 9; article 10, except paragraph 1; article 12 (2) and (4); article 14, except paragraphs 2 and 5 and subparagraphs (a), (b), (d) and (g) of paragraph 3; article 17; article 19; article 21 and article 22. Article 2 (2) remains in force for those rights that have not been suspended, and paragraph 3 of the same remains in force for all those offences which do not affect national security and public order.

30 January 1987

(Dated 29 January 1987)

Taking into account the continuation and the escalation of the military, political and economic aggressions by the United States of America, the State of National Emergency has been re-established as from 9 January 1987 by Decree No. 245. Accordingly and throughout the territory of Nicaragua and until 8 January 1988 the following provisions of the Covenant are suspended:

Article 2 (3) in respect of acts which undermine national security and public order and of the rights and guarantees set forth in those provisions of the Covenant which have been suspended;

Article 9 (solely for offences against national security and public order).

Article 12 and article 14 (3) (c); article 17, in so far as it relates to home and correspondence, with the other rights remaining in effect;

Articls 19, 21 and 22.

13 May 1987

(Dated 8 April 1987)

By Decree No. 250 dated 23 February 1987, confirming a previous Decree No. 245 of 9 January 1987, the Government of Nicaragua has reinstated the State of emergency for a year as of 28 February 1987, owing to the unjust, unlawful and cruel war of aggression waged against Nicaragua. Accordingly, the following articles of the Covenant are being derogated from:

Article 2, paragraph 3, in which we draw a distinction between administrative *amparo* which is suspended in respect of the rights and guarantees provided in the Covenant, which have been suspended, and the remedy of *habeas corpus,* which is not applicable to offences against national security and public order;

Article 9. It should be understood that the remedy referred to in paragraph 4 is suspended solely in respect of offences against national security and public order;

Article 12, regarding the right of residence, liberty of movement and freedom to enter and leave the country;

Article 14, paragraph (3), regarding the right to be tried without undue delay;

Article 17, in respect of the inviolability of the home and correspondence with the other rights remaining in effect;

Article 19, paragraphs (1) and (2), regarding the right to hold opinions and the freedom of expression.

8 February 1988

(Dated 4 February 1988)

Suspension of the state of emergency in force in the country, thus re-establishing the full enjoyment of all rights and guarantees of Nicaraguans laid down in the Constitution of Nicaragua.

20 May 1993

(Dated 19 May 1993)

Partial suspension for a period of 30 days by Decree 30-93 of 18 May 1993 as from that same date of the rights and guarantees provided for in articles 17 (in respect of the inviolability of the home), 9(1)(2)(3) and (5) within the 14 Nicaraguan municipalities located in the departments of Matagalpa, Jinotega, Estelí, Nueva Segovia and Madriz for the purpose of restoring lawnd order and public safety in accordance with the needs expressed since criminal offences have been perpetrated continually in certain municipalities in the country threatening public order and personal security. Moreover, some members of armed groups have continued to engage in unlawful rebel activities.

13 August 1993

(Dated 11 August 1993)

Re-establishment of the rights and guarantees provided for in articles 17 and 9 of the Covenant as from 17 June 1993 in the affected municipalities and throughout Nicaragua.

1 June 2005

On 1 June 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Nicaragua a notification signed by the President dated 30 May 2005, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, declaring a state of emergency had been established pursuant to Decree No. 34-2005 to reduce the impact of the socio-economic and political crisis that Nicaragua is undergoing.

The above notification specified that the provisions partially derogated from are article 2, paragraphs 1 and 3 (a), (b) and (c), and article 9, paragraph 3, of the Covenant.

3 June 2005

On 3 June 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Nicaragua a notification made under article 4 (3) of the Covenant transmitting Decree No. 38-2005 dated 2 June 2005, which declared that the economic emergency which had been established by Decree No. 34-2005 was repealed and that the constitutional rights and guarantees have been restored.

PANAMA

21 June 1987

(Dated 11 June 1987)

Declaration of the State of emergency throughout the territory of the Republic of Panama. The notification specifies that the state of emergency was declared since, on 9 and 10 June 1987, there were outbreaks of violence, clashes between demonstrators and units of defence forces, and incitement to violence by individuals and political groups resulting in personal injury and considerable material damage. The measure was taken with a view to restoring law and order and safeguarding the life, the dignity and the property of Panamanian nationals and of foreigners living in Panama.

The articles of the Covenant being derogated from are articles 12, paragraph 1; 17, with regard to the inviolability of correspondence; 19 and 21.

1 July 1987

Termination of the State of emergency and reinstatement of all constitutional guarantees as at 30 June 1987.

PERU

[For notifications made by Peru received by the Secretary-General between 22 March 1983 and 12 December 2006, see note 1 under "Peru" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.]

24 January 2007

... by Supreme Decree No. 005-2007-PCM, issued on 18 January 2007, a state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; the province of Satipo, Andamarca district of the province of Concepción, and Santo Domingo de Acobamba district of the province of Huancayo, department of Junín, has been extended for 60 days from 25 January 2007.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended.

21 February 2007

... by Supreme Decree No. 011-2007-PCM issued on 15 February 2007 together with a corrigendum, the state of emergency in the provinces of Marañón, Huacaybamba, Leoncio Prado and Huamalíes, department of Huánuco, the province of Tocache, department of San Martín, and the province of Padre Abad, department of Ucayali, has been extended for a period of 60 days. A previous extension was communicated in our note No. 7-1-SG/044 dated 20 October 2006.

During the state of emergency, the rights recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru are suspended.

30 March 2007

... by Supreme Decree No. 026-2007-PCM, issued on 22 March 2007, the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; the province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; the province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; and the province of Satipo, the Andamarca district of the province of Concepción and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba district of the province of Huancayo, Department of Junín, has been extended for a period of 60 days as from 26 March 2007.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, liberty of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized, respectively, in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

... by Supreme Decree No. 016-2007-PCM, issued on 2 March 2007, a state of emergency was declared in the department of Arequipa, province of Islay, district of Cocachacra, for a period of 30 days.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, established in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru, and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

5 April 2007

... by Supreme Decree No. 030-2007-PCM, issued on 31 March 2007, the state of emergency in the department of Arequipa, province of Islay, district of Cocachacra, was extended for a period of 30 days from 1 April 2007.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, established in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru, and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

25 April 2007

... by Supreme Decree No. 039-2007-PCM issued on 18 April 2007, the state of emergency in the provinces of Marañón, Huacaybamba, Leoncio Prado and Huamalíes, department of Huánuco, the province of Tocache, department of San Martín, and the province of Padre Abad, department of Ucayali, has been extended for a period of 60 days. A previous extension was communicated in our note No. 7-1-SG/06 of 20 February 2007.

During the state of emergency, the rights to the inviolability of the home, freedom of movement and assembly, and liberty and security of person recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended.

6 June 2007

... by Supreme Decree No. 044-2007-PCM issued on 24 May 2007, a state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; the province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; the province of La Convención, Department of Cusco; and the province of Satipo, the Andamarca and Comas districts of the province of Concepción and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca districts of the province of Huancayo, Department of Junín has been extended for a period of 60 days as from 25 May 2007. A previous extension was communicated in Note 7-1-SG/009 of 28 March 2007.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, liberty of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized, respectively, in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

11 June 2007

... by Supreme Decree No. 045-2007-PCM issued on 25 May 2007, a state of emergency has been declared in the Santa Anita district of the province of Lima, Department of Lima, for a period of seven days.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, liberty of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized, respectively, in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

11 July 2007

... by Supreme Decree No. 056-2007-PCM issued on 2 July 2007, a state of emergency in the provinces of Marañón, Huacaybamba, Leoncio Prado and Huamalíes, department of Huánuco, the province of Tocache, department of San Martín, and the province of Padre Abad, department of Ucayali, has been extended for a period of 60 days. A previous extension was communicated in our note No. 7-1-SG/013 of 24 April 2007.

During the state of emergency, the rights to the inviolability of the home, freedom of movement and assembly, and liberty and security of person recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended.

26 July 2007

... by Supreme Decree No. 065-2007-PCM, issued on 21 July 2007, extended the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, Department of Ayacucho; the province of Tayacaja, Department of Huancavelica; the districts of Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabambaof the provinceof La Convención, Department of Cusco; and the province of Satipo, the Andamarca and Comas districts of the province of Concepción and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca districts of the province of Huancayo, Department of Junín, for a period of 60 days as from 24 July 2007. A previous extension was communicated in Note 7-1-SG/017 of 6 June 2007.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, liberty of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized, respectively, in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

13 September 2007

... by Supreme Decree No. 077-2007-PCM, issued on 30 August 2007, extended the state of emergency in the provinces of Marañón, Huacaybamba, Leoncio Prado and Huamalíes, department of Huánuco, the province of Tocache, department of San Martín, and the province of Padre Abad, department of Ucayali, has been extended for a period of 60 days as from 31 August 2007.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, liberty of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized, respectively, in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12 , 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are suspended.

7 January 2008

... by Supreme Decree No. 099-2007-PCM, issued on 28 December 2007, thestate of emergency in the Districts of San Buenaventura and Cholón, Province of Marañón, in the Province of Leoncio Prado and in the District of Monzón, Province of Huamalíes, Department of Huánuco; in the Province of Tocache, Department of San Martín; and in the Province of Padre Abad, Department of Ucayali, has been extended for 60 days as from 29 December 2007.

During the state of emergency the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

12 February 2008

... by Supreme Decree No. 005-2008-PCM, published on 19 January 2008, the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho, the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica, the Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba districts of the province of La Convención, department of Cusco, the province of Satipo, the Andamarca and Comas districts of the province of Concepción and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca districts of the province of Huancaya, department of Junín, has been extended for sixty days, beginning 20 January 2008. A previous extension and declaration were communicated in Note 7-1-SG/009 of 28 March 2007.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of association and liberty and security of the person, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shallbe suspended.

21 February 2008

... by Supreme Decree No. 012-2008-PCM, published on 18 February 2008, a state of emergency has been declared in the Provinces of Huaura, Huaral and Barranca, Department of Lima; in the Provinces of Huarmey, Casma and Santa, Department of Ancash; and in the Province of Virú, Department of La Libertad, for a period of seven days.

During the state of emergency the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

12 March 2008

..., by Supreme Decree No. 019-2008-PCM, issued on 6 March 2008, a state of emergency has been declared in Cholón district of the province of Marañón, in Monzón district of the province of Huamalíes and in Leoncio Prado province, department of Huánuco; in Tocache province, department of San Martín; and Padre Abad province, department of Ucayali, for a period of 60 days.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended.

8 May 2008

... by Supreme Decree No. 019-2008-PCM, issued on 4 May 2008, the state of emergency in Cholón district of the Province of Marañón, in Monzón district of the Province of Huamalíes and in the Province of Leoncio Prado, Department of Huánuco; the Province of Tocache, Department of San Martín; and the Province of Padre Abad, Department of Ucayali, has been extended for a period of 60 days, beginning 6 May 2008. A previous extension was communicated in Note 7-1-SG/09 of 12 March 2008.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended.

9 July 2008

...by Supreme Decree No. 045-2008-PCM, published on 3 July 2008, the state of emergency in the Cholón district in Marañón province, the Monzón district in Huamalíes province, and Leoncio Prado province, all of which are located in the department of Huánuco; Tocache province, department of San Martín; and Padre Abad province, department of Ucayali, has been extended for 60 days from 5 July 2008.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended.

21 July 2008

... by Supreme Decree No. 046-2008-PCM, issued on 12 July 2008, the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; the Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba districts of the

province of La Convención, department of Cusco; the province of Satipo; the Andamarca and Comas districts of the province of Concepción; and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca districts of the province of Huancayo, department of Junín has been extended for 60 days as from 18 July 2008.

During the state of emergency, the right to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended.

8 August 2008

... by Supreme Decree No. 045-2008-PCM, published on 3 July 2008, the state of emergency in the Cholón district in Marañón province, the Monzón district in Huamalíes province, and Leoncio Prado province, all of which are located in the department of Huánuco; Tocache province, department of San Martín; and Padre Abad province, department of Ucayali, has been extended for 60 days from 5 July 2008.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended.

8 August 2008

... by Supreme Decree No. 038-2008-PCM, issued on 15 May 2008, the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho, the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica, the Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba districts of the province of La Convención, department of Cusco, the province of Satipo, the Andamarca and Comas districts of the province of Concepción and the Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca districts of the province of Huancayo, department of Junín, has been extended for sixty days, beginning 19 May 2008.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of association and liberty and security of the person, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

22 August 2008

... by Supreme Decree No. 058-2008-PCM, issued on 18 August 2008, a state of emergency was declared in the Provinces of Bagua and Utcubamba, Department of Amazonas; the Province of Datem del Marañón, Department of Loreto; and the Echarate district of the Province of La Convención, Department of Cusco, for a period of thirty days as from 19 August 2008.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

2 September 2008

... by Supreme Decree No. 060-2008-PCM, issued on 28 August 2008, the state of emergency in the Cholón District in Marañón Province, the Monzón District in Huamalíes Province, and Leoncio Prado Province, all of which are located in the Department of Huánuco; in Tocache Province, Department of San Martín; and in Padre Abad Province, Department of Ucayali, has been extended for a period of 60 days from 3 September 2008.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person enshrined in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended.

2 September 2008

... by Supreme Decree No. 061-2008-PCM, which was issued on 28 August 2008, Supreme Decree No. 058-2008-PCM, which established a state of emergency in the Provinces of Bagua and Utcubamba in the Department of Amazonas; in the Province of Datem del Marañón in the Department of Loreto; and in the Echarate District of La Convención Province in the Department of Cusco, has been declared null and void.

18 September 2008

... by Supreme Decree No. 063-2008-PCM, issued on 12 September 2008, the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; in the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; in the Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba districts of the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; in the province of Satipo; in the Andamarca and Comas

districts of the province of Concepción; and in the Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca districts of the province of Huancayo, department of Junín, has been extended for 60 days, beginning 16 September 2008.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of the person, recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the InternationalCovenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

12 November 2008

... by Supreme Decree No. 070-2008-PCM, issued on 4 November 2008, a state of emergency has been declared, as from 5 November 2008, in the provinces of Tacna, Jorge Basadre, Candarave and Tarata, department of Tacna.

During the state of emergency the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

18 November 2008

... by Supreme Decree No. 072-2008-PCM, published on 13 November 2008, the state of emergency has been extended for a period of 60 days, beginning 15 November 2008, in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; in the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; in the districts of Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba in the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; in the province of Satipo; in the districts of Andamarca and Comas in the province of Concepción and in the districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca in the province of Huancayo, department of Junín.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f), of the Political Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, will be suspended.

16 December 2008

... by Supreme Decree No. 072-2008-PCM, published on 13 November 2008, the state of emergency has been extended for 60 days,

beginning 15 November 2008, in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; in the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; in the districts of Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba in the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; in the province of Satipo; in the districts of Andamarca and Comas in the province of Concepción; and in the districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca in the province of Huancayo, department of Junín.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24(f) of the Political Constitutionof Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, shall be suspended.

14 January 2009

... by Supreme Decree No. 001-2009-PCM, published on 10 January 2009, the state of emergency has been extended for 60 days,

with effect from 14 January 2009, in the provinces of Huanta and La Mar, department of Ayacucho; in the province of Tayacaja, department of Huancavelica; in the districts of Kimbiri, Pichari and Vilcabamba in the province of La Convención, department of Cusco; in the province of Satipo; and in the districts of Andamarca and Comas in the province of Concepción and the districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca in the province of Huancayo, department of Junín.

During the state of emergency, the rights to inviolability of the home, freedom of movement, freedom of assembly, and liberty and security of person, which are recognized in article 2, paragraphs 9, 11, 12 and 24 (f) of thePolitical Constitution of Peru and in articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, respectively, are suspended.

POLAND

1 February 1982

"In connection with the proclamation of martial law by the Council of State of the Polish People's Republic, as based on article 33, paragraph 2, of Poland's Constitution, there has been temporary derogation from or limitation of application of provisions of articles 9, 12 (paragraphs1 and 2), 14 (paragraph 5), 19 (paragraphs 2, 21 and 22) of the Covenant, to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation ...

Temporary limitation of certain rights of citizens has been prompted by the supreme national interest. It was caused by the exigencies of averting a civil war, economic anarchy as well as destabilization of state and social structures ...

The restrictive measures in question are of a temporary nature. They have already been considerably cut back and along with the stabilizing of the situation, will be successively terminated."

22 December 1982

Basing on the law by the Diet (Seym) of the Polish People's Republic of 18 December 1982 concerning special legal regulation in the time of suspension of martial law, derogation from Covenant's articles 9, 12 paragraphs 1 and 2, articles 21 and 22, has been terminated as of 31 December 1982.

By terms of the same law as well as a result of earlier successive measures, restrictions in the application of Covenant provisions which are still derogated from, namely article 14 paragraph 5 and article 19 paragraph 2, have also been considerably reduced.

For instance, with reference to Covenant's article 14 paragraph 5, emergency procedures have been lifted in relation to crimes and offences committed in social conflicts out of political motivations, they have only been retained with regard to crimes most dangerous to State's basic economic interests as well as to life, health and property of its citizens.

25 July 1983

Termination as from 22 July 1983 of derogations.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

18 October 1988

(Dated 13 October 1988)

[Owing to] nationalistic clashes in the Soviet Union in the Nagorno-Karabach Autonomous Region and the Agdam district of the Azerbaydzhan Soviet Socialist Republic [and to] contraventions of public order, accompanied in a number of cases by the use of weapons, [which] have unfortunately resulted in casualties and damage to the property of the State and of private individuals [and owing to the attack of] some State institutions ... a state of emergency has been temporarily imposed, and a curfew is in effect, in the Nagorno-Karabach Autonomous Region and the Agdam district of the Azerbaydzhan SSR, as of 21 September 1988. The state of emergency has been imposed in order to restore public order, protect citizens' individual and property rights and enforce strict compliance with the law, in accordance with the powers conferred by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

While the state of emergency is in force, demonstrations, rallies, meetings and strikes are banned. The movements of civilians and vehicles are restricted between 9 p.m. and 6 a.m. These restrictions represent a partial departure from the provisions of articles 12 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Steps to ensure the safety of civilians and maintain public order are being taken by units of the militia and the armed forces. The local and central organs of power and government are taking steps to normalize the situation; and elucidation effort is in progress, with the aim of preventing criminal acts and incitement to national hatred.

Further [information will be provided as concerns] the date on which the state of emergency is lifted after the normalization of the situation.

17 January 1990

(Dated 15 January 1990)

Proclamation of the state of emergency as from 11 p.m. local time on 15 January 1990, in territory of the Nagorno-Karabach autonomous region, the regions of the Azerbaijan SSR adjacent thereto, the Gorissa region of the Armenian SSR and the border zone along the state frontier between the USSR and the territory of the Azerbaijan SSR. The state of emergency was proclaimed owing to incitement by extremist groups which are organizing disorders, stirring up dissension and hostility between nationalities, and do not hesitate to mine roads, open fire in inhabited areas and take hostages. Articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant were accordingly suspended.

25 January 1990

(Dated 29 January 1990)

Proclamation of the state of emergency, as from 20 January in the city of Baku and application to that territory of the Decree adopted by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on 15 January 1990, in the light of massive disorders organized by criminal extremist forces to overthrow the Government, and also with a view to ensure the protection and security of citizens. Articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant are accordingly suspended.

26 March 1990

(Dated 23 March 1990)

Establishment of the state of emergency as from 12 February 1990 in Dushanbe (Tadzhik SSR) because of widespread disorders, arson and other criminal acts which resulted in a threat to the citizens. Articles 9, 12 and 21 of the Covenant were accordingly suspended.

5 November 1992

(Dated 3 November 1992)

Establishment of the state of emergency from 2 p.m. on 2 November 1992 to 2 p.m. on 2 December 1992 in the territory of the North Ossetian SSR and the Ingush Republic as a result of the serious deterioration in the situation with mass disturbances and conflicts between minorities accompanied by violence involving the use of weapons and military equipment and leading to the loss of human lives, and also in view of the threat to the security and territorial integrity of the Russian Federation. Articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant were accordingly suspended.

7 April 1993

(Dated 7 April 1993)

Establishment of thetate of emergency from 1400 hours on 31 March 1993 to 1400 hours on 31 May 1993 in the Prigorodny district and adjacent areas of the North Ossetian SSR and part of the Nazran district of the Ingush Republic due to "the continuing deterioration of the situation in parts of the North Ossetian Socialist Republic and the Ingush Republic, popular unrest and inter-ethnic conflicts, accompanied by violence involving the use of arms and military equipment".

The provisions from which it has derogated are articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant.

13 August 1993

(Dated 10 August 1993)

Proclamation of the state of emergency by Decree No. 1149 of 27 and 30 July 1993, as from 31 July 1993 at 1400 hours until 30 September 1993 at 1400 hours in the territories of the Mozdok district, the Prigorodny district and adjacent localities of the North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR) and the Malgobek and Nazran districts of the Ingush Republic due to the deterio ration of the situation in certain parts of these territories.

The provisions from which it has derogated are articles 12 (1), 13, 17(1), 19(2), 21 and 22.

5 October 1993

(Dated 4 October 1993)

Proclamation of the state of emergency as from 3 October 1993 at 4 p.m. to 10 October 1993 at 4 p.m. in the city of Moscow "in connection with the attempts of extremist forces to provoke mass violence through organized attacks against the representatives of authority and the Police". The provisions from which it has derogated are articles 12(1), 13, 19(2) and 22.

22 October 1993

(Dated 21 October 1993)

Extension of the state of emergency in the city of Moscow pursuant to Decree No. 1615 of 9 October 1993 until 18 October 1993 at 5 a.m. owing to "the need to ensure further normalization of the situation in Moscow, strengthen the rule of law and ensure the security of the inhabitants after the attempted armed *coup d'état* of 3-4 October 1993

27 October 1993

Teration of the state of emergency established in Moscow pursuant to Decree of 3 October 1993 and extended pursuant to Decree of 9 October 1993, as from 18 October 1993 at 5 a.m.

28 October 1993

(Dated 28 October 1993)

Proclamation of the state of emergency pursuant to Presidential Decree of 29 September 1993 as from 30 September 1993 at 1400 hours until 30 November 1993 at 1400 hours in the territories of the Mozdok district, the Prigorodny district and adjacent localities of the North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Malgobek and Nazran districts of the Ingush Republic. The Government of the Russian Federation specified that the reasons for the state of emergency were the deterioration of the situation in a number of districts of the North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Ingush Republic as a result of the non-implementation of the agreements concluded earlier by the two sides and the decisions of the interim administration regarding the settlement of the conflict, and the increase in the number of acts of terrorism and violence. (Derogations from articles 12(1), 13, 19(2) and 22.)

29 December 1993

(Dated 23 December 1993)

Extension of the state of emergency until 31 January 1994 at 1400 hours by Presidential Decree to parts of the territories of the Republic of North Ossetia and the Ingush Republic ... necessitated by the worsening of the situation in a number of districts of the Republic of North Ossetia and the Ingush Republic.

18 February 1994

(Dated 22 June 1993)

In view of the deterioration of the situation and the increased frequency of terrorist acts and widespread disorder on national soil involving the use of firearms, the President of Russia issued a Decree on 29 May 1993 declaring a state of emergency from 1400 hours on 31 May 1993 to 1400 hours on 31 July 1993 in the Mozdok district, the Prigorodny district and adjacent localities of the North Ossetian SSR and in the Malgobek and Nazran dtricts of the Ingush Republic.

The Government of the Russian Federation has specified that the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant.

25 April 1994

(Dated 22 April 1994)

In view of the continuing state of tension in a number of districts of the Republic of North Ossetia and the Ingush Republic, the unceasing acts of terrorism and violence, including violence against the civilian population, and the still unresolved problem of refugees, the President of the Russian Federation issued Decree No. 657 on 4 April 1994 declaring a state of emergency from 1400 hours on 31 March 1994 until 1400 hours on 31 May 1994 in territories of the Mozdok district, the Pravoberezhny district, the Prigorodny district and the city of Vladikavkaz (Republic of North Ossetia) and of the Malgobek and Nazran districts (Ingush Republic).

The Government of the Russian Federation has specified that the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 12 (1) and (2), 19 (2), 21 and 22 (1) and (2) of the Covenant.

23 May 1994

(Dated 20 May 1994)

Proclamation of the state of emergency by Decree No. 836 on 27 April 1994 from 2 p.m. on 27 April 1994 to 2 p.m. on 31 May 1994 in a portion of the territory of the Republic of North Ossetia. The said Decree extends the applicability of paragraphs 3 to 8 of presidential Decree No. 657 of 4 April 1994 to the territories of the Prigorodny district (the Oktyabrskoe, Kambileevskoe and Sunja populated areas) and Vladikavkaz (the Sputnik military cantonment), in the Republic of North Ossetia. *(In this regard, reference is made to the notification received on 25 April 1994 and dated 22 April 1994).*

The Government of the Russian Federation has specified that the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 12 (1) and (2), 19 (2), 21 and 22 (1) and (2) of the Covenant.

21 June 1994

(Dated 21 June 1994)

Lifting, as from 31 May 1994, by virtue of Decreeo. 1112 of 30 May 1994, of the state of emergency in part of the territories of the Republic of North Ossetia and the Ingush Republic, instituted by the President of the Russian Federation under Decrees Nos. 657 of 4 April 1994 and 836 of 27 April 1994. *(In this regard, reference is made to the notifications received on 25 April and 23 May 1994, and dated 22 April and 20 May 1994, respectively)* .

Declaration of the state of emergency as from 31 May 1994 at 1400 hours until 31 July 1994 at 1400 hours in the following territories: Mozdok district, the Pravoberezhny district, the Prigorodny district, the city of Vladikavkaz (Republic of North Ossetia, the Malgobek, Nazran, Sunzha and Dzheirakh districts (Ingush Republic) by Decree 1112 of 30 May 1994, in view of the continuing state of tension in those districts and the need to ensure the return of refugees and forcibly displaced persons to their places of permanent residence and implement a set of measures aimed at eliminating the consequences of the armed conflict.

Derogation from the provisions of article 12 (1) and (2), 19 (2), 21 and 22 (1) and (2) of the Covenant.

12 August 1994

(Dated 12 August 1994)

Lifting as from 31 July 1994 of the state of emergency in part of the territories of the Republic of North Ossetia and the Ingush Republic, instituted on 30 May 1994 *(in this regard, reference is made to the notification received on 21 June 1994)* , and proclamation of a state of emergency from 1400 hours on 31 July 1994 until 1400 hours on 30 September 1994 in the territories of the Mozdok, Pravoberezhny, and Prigorodny districts, the city of Vladikavkaz (Republic of North Ossetia), and of Malgobek, Nazran, Sunja and Dzheirakh districts (Ingush Republic) in view of the continuing state of tension in those territories and the need for refugees and forcibly displaced persons to return to their places of permanent residence as well as for the elimination of the consequences of armed conflict.

Derogation from the provisions of article 12 (1) and (2), 19 (2), 21 and 22 (1) and (2) of the Covenant.

(21 October 1994)

(Dated 21 October 1994)

Lifting of the state of emergency instituted by Decree No. 1541 of 25 July 1994 and proclamation of a state of emergency with effect from 1400 hours on 3 October 1994 until 1400 hours on 2 December 1994 in the territories of the Mozdok, Pravoberzhny and Prigorodny districts and the city of Vladikavkaz (Republic of North Ossetia) and the Malgobek, Nazran, Sunja and Djeirakh districts (Ingush Republic) in view of the continuing state of tension and the need to ensure the return of forcibly displaced persons to their places of permanent residence and the implementation of a set of measures to deal with the aftermath of the armed conflict in order to guarantee State and public security.

Derogation from the provisions of articles 12 (1) and (2), 19 (2), 21 and 22 (1) and (2) of the Covenant.

5 January 1995

(Dated 4 January 1995)

Proclamation by Decree No. 2145 of 2 December 1994 of the state of emergency from 1400 hours on 3

December 1994 until 1400 hours on 31 January 1995 in the territories of the Mozdok district, the Pravoberezhny district, the Pigorodny district and the city of Vladikavkaz (Republic of North Ossetia) and of the Malgobek, Narzan, Sunzha and Dzheyrakh districts (Ingush Republic) for the same reasons as those given in notification of 21 October 1994.

Derogation from the provisions of articles 12, 19 (2), 21 and 22 (1) and (2) of the Covenant.

SERBIA

13 March 2003

(Dated 12 March 2003)

On 13 March 2003, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Serbia and Montenegro a notification, made under article 4 (3) of the above Covenant, transmitting the Decision and the Order dated 12 March 2003 from the Acting President of the Republic, concerning the declaration of a state of emergency in the Republic.

The above Order, issued by the Acting President of the Republic of Serbia concerning special measures to be applied during the state of emergency, provides for the derogation from rights guaranteed by Articles 9, 12, 14, 17, 19, 21 and 22 (2) of the Covenant.

24 April 2003

(Dated 23 April 2003)

Termination of the state of emergency as proclaimed on 12 March 2003.

SRI LANKA

21 May 1984

Proclamation of state of emergency throughout Sri Lanka, and derogation as a consequence from articles 9 (3) and 14 (3) (b) of the Covenant as from 18 May 1983.

23 May 1984

The Government of Sri Lanka specified that the Emergency regulations and Special Laws were temporary measures necessitated by the existence of an extraordinary security situation and that it was not intended to continue with them longer than it was absolutely necessary.

16 January 1989

(Dated 13 January 1989)

Termination of the state of emergency as from 11 January 1989.

29 August 1989

(Dated 18 August 1989)

Establishment of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days as from 20 June 1989 and derogation from provisions of article 9 (2).

The notification specifies that the state of emergency was declared in view of the progressive escalation of violence, acts of sabotage and the disruption of essential services throughout the country as from the termination of the state of emergency on 11 January 1989 *(see previous notification of 16 January 1989)* .

4 October 1994

(Dated 29 September 1994)

Lifting of the state of emergency established on 20 June 1989 and notified by notification of 18 August 1989, as from 4 September 1994, except with regard to the Northern and Eastern Provinces and certain areas which border the above two Provinces specifically designated in the Presidential Proclamation dated 1 September 1994.

30 May 2000

(Dated 30 May 2000)

Declaration of a State of emergency in Sri Lanka

Derogation from articles 9 (2), 9 (3), 12 (1), 12 (2), 14 (3), 17 (1), 19 (2), 21 and 22.

SUDAN

14 February 1992

(Dated 21 August 1991)

"The state of emergency was declared all over the Sudan on June 30, 1989, when the Revolution for National Salvation took over the power, in order to ensure security and safety of the country. *[The articles of the Covenant which are being derogated from are articles 2 and 22 (1) as subsequently indicated by the Government of the Sudan.]*

The reasons for declaring the State of Emergency were [that] the Revolution has in June 1989, inherited a very chaotic socio-economic and political situation with a civil war raging in the South (the Civil War started in 1983 and since then the state of emergency was declared), and lawlessness engulfing the North, and armed-robbery being practised, in a serious manner, in the west (as a result of the present crisis in Tchad), and also in the east, in addition to possible threats of foreign interventions.

The emergency regulations were also issued to complement the provisions of the Constitutional Decree No. (2) (the State of Emergency) which contain more that 40 sections aimed at ensuring security and safety of the country. But no person has ever been convicted till now, or sentenced to death in accordance with these regulations since the declaration of the state of emergency. The army officers who were executed on July 26, 1990, were charged in accordance with: -

I) The People's Armed Forces Act (Section 47).

II) Rules of Procedure for the People's Armed Forces Act, 1983 (Section127).

III) The Penal Code, 1983 (Section 96).

Other three civilians were sentenced to death in accordance with the provisions of the Dealing in Currency Act, 1981.

It has to be mentioned that the President of the National Salvation Revolution Command Council had issued last April a general amnesty by which all the political detainees were released, and powers of detention entrusted to the Judiciary. Also a decree had been issued abrogating the Special courts which were established in accordance with the constitution of the Special Courts Act, 1989 and its Amendment of January 30, 1990, to have Jurisdiction over acts and charges arising from violation of the Constitutional Decrees and the Emergency Regulations.

Under those circumstances, it became necessary for the Revolution to proclaim the State of Emergency Regulations.

In conclusion, it was to be emphasised that the existence of the state of emergency in the Sudan came well before the eruption of the National Salvation Revolution in June 1989. As stated above, it initially came as a direct result of the political and military situation that existed, and still exists, in the Southern part of the country.

However, with the achievement of progress in the peace process and the establishment of the political system, which is currently underway, the State of Emergency will naturally be lifted."

17 August 2001

The Government of the Sudan informed [the Secretary-General] that the state of emergency in the Sudan has been extended until 31 December 2001.

20 December 2001

(Dated 19 December 2001)

The Government of the Sudan informed [the Secretary-General] that the state of emergency in the Sudan has been extended until 31 December 2002.

SURINAME

18 March 1991

Termination, as from 1 September 1989, of the state of emergency declared on 1 December 1986 in the territory of the Districts of Marowijne, Commewijne, Para, Brokopondo and in part of the territory of the district of Sipaliwini (between the Marowijne river and 56 ° WLO. The articles of the Covenant being derogated from were articles 12, 21 and 22 of the Covenant.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

6 November 1990

(Dated 15 August 1990)

Proclamation of state of emergency in the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago as from 28 July 1990 for a period of ninety days and derogation from articles 9, 12, 21 and 14 (3).

18 August 1995

(Dated 11 August 1995)

By a Proclamation issued on 3 August 1995, a state of emergency has been declared in the City of Port of Spain as of 3 August 1995 owing to the fact that, as indicated by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, action has been taken or is immediately threatened by persons or bodies of persons of such a nature and on so extensive a scale as to be likely to endanger the public safety or to deprive the community of supplies or services essential to life. The provisions of the Covenant from which the Government of Trinidiad and Tobago has derogated are articles 9, 12, 14 (3) and 21.

The said state of emergency was lifted on 7 August 1995 by a resolution of the House of Representatives.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

17 May 1976

"The Government of the United Kingdom notify other States Parties to the present Covenant, in accordance with article 4, of their intention to take and continue measures derogating from their obligations under the Covenant.

"There have been in the United Kingdom in recent years campaigns of organised terrorism related to Northern Irish affairs which have manifested themselves in activities which have included murder, attempted murder, maiming, intimidation and violent civil disturbances and in bombing and fire-raising which have resulted in death, injury and widespread destruction of property. This situation constitutes a public emergency within the meaning of article 4 (1) of the Covenant. The emergency commenced prior to the ratification by United Kingdom of the Covenant and Legislation has, from time to time, been promulgated with regard to it.

"The Government of the United Kingdom have found it necessary (and in some cases continue to find it necessary) to take powers, to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation, for the protection of life, for the protection of property and the prevention of outbreaks of public disorder, and including the exercise of powers of arrest and detention and exclusion. In so far as any of these measures is inconsistent with the provisions of articles 9, 10 (2), 10 (3), 12 (1), 14, 17, 19 (2), 21 or 22 of the Covenant, the United Kingdom hereby derogates from its obligations under those provisions."

22 August 1984

Termination forthwith of derogations from articles 9, 10 (2), 10 (3), 12 (1), 14, 17, 19 (2), 21 and 22 of the Covenant.

23 December 1988

[The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland] have found it necessary to take or continue measures derogating in certain respects from their obligations under article 9 of the Covenant. *(For the reasons of that decision, see paragraph 2 of a previous notification of 17 May 1976, which continue to apply)* .

Persons reasonably suspected of involvement in terrorism connected with the affairs of Northern Ireland, or of offences under the legislation and who have been detained for 48 hours may be, on the authority of the Secretary of State, further detained without charge for periods of up to five days.

Notwithstanding the judgement of 29 November 1988 by the European Court of Human Rights in the case of *Brogan and Others* the Government has found it necessary to continue to exercise the powers described above but to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation to enable necessary enquiries and investigations properly to be completed in order to decide whether criminal proceedings should be instituted. [This notice is given] in so far as these measures may be inconsistent with article 9 (3) of the Covenant.

31 March 1989

(Dated 23 March 1989)

Replacement as from 22 March 1989, of the measures indicated in the previous notification of 23 December 1988 by section 14 of and paragraph 6 of Schedule 5 to the Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act 1989, which make comparable provisions.

18 December 1989

(Dated 12 December 1989)

"The Government of the United Kingdom have [previously] found it necessary to take and continue [various measures], derogating in certain respects from obligations under Article 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

On 14 November 1989 the Home Secretary announced that the Government had concluded that a satisfactory procedure for the review of detention of terrorist suspects involving the judiciary had not been identified and that the derogation notified under Article 4 of the Covenant would therefore remain in place for as long as circumstances require."

21 February 2001

(Dated 20 February 2001)

Notification to the effect that the derogation from article 9 (3) of the Covenant is terminated with effect from Mony, 26 February 2001.

The notification further states that the termination of the derogation only applies to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and that it is not yet possible to terminate the derogation in respect of the Bailiwick of Jersey, the Bailiwick of Guernsey and the Isle of Man.

18 December 2001

"Notification of the United Kingdom's derogation from article 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: [..The Government of the United Kingdom conveys] the following information in order to ensure compliance with the obligations of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under Article 4 (3) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights adopted by the General Assembly on 16 December 1966.

Public emergency in the United Kingdom

The terrorist attacks in New York, Washington, D.C. and Pennsylvania on 11th September 2001 resulted in several thousand deaths, including many British victims and others from 70 different countries. In its resolutions 1368 (2001) and 1373 (2001), the United Nations Security Council recognised the attacks as a threat to international peace and security.

The threat from international terrorism is a continuing one. In its resolution 1373 (2001), the Security Council, acting under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, required all States to take measures to prevent the commission of terrorist attacks, including by denying safe haven to those who finance, plan, support or commit terrorist attacks.

There exists a terrorist threat to the United Kingdom from persons suspected of involvement in international terrorism. In particular, there are foreign nationals present in the United Kingdom who are suspected of being concerned in the commission, preparation or instigation of acts of international terrorism, of being members of organisations or groups which are so concerned or of having links with members of such organisations orand who are a threat to the national security of the United Kingdom.

As a result, a public emergency, within the meaning of Article 4(1) of the Covenant, exists in the United Kingdom.

The Anti-terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001

As a result of the public emergency, provision is made in the Anti-terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001, inter alia, for an extended power to arrest and detain a foreign national which will apply where it is intended to remove or deport the person from the United Kingdom but where removal or deportation is not for the time being possible, with the consequence that the detention would be unlawful under existing domestic law powers. The extended power to arrest and detain will apply where the Secretary of State issues a certificate indicating his belief that the person's presence in the United Kingdom is a risk to national security and that he suspects the person of being an international terrorist. That certificate will be subject to an appeal to the Special Immigration Appeals Commission ('SIA'), established under the Special Immigration Appeals Commission Act 1997, which will have power to cancel it if it considers that the certificate should not have been issued. There will be an appeal on a point of law from a ruling by SIAC. In addition, the certificate will be reviewed by SIAC at regular intervals. SIAC will also be able to grant bail, where appropriate, subject to conditions. It will be open to a detainee to end his detention at any time by agreeing to leave the United Kingdom.

The extended power of arrest and detention in the Anti-terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001 is a measure which is strictly required by the exigencies of the situation. It is a temporary provision which comes into force for an initial period of 15 months and then expires unless renewed by Parliament. Thereafter, it is subject to annual renewal by Parliament. If, at any time, in the Government's assessment, the public emergencyer exists or the extended power is no longer strictly required by the exigencies of the situation, then the Secretary of State will, by Order, repeal the provision.

Domestic law powers of detention (other than under the Anti-terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001)

The Government has powers under the Immigration Act 1971 ('the 1971 Act') to remove or deport persons on the ground that their presence in the United Kingdom is not conducive to the public good on national security grounds. Persons can also be arrested and detained under Schedules 2 and 3 to the 1971 Act pending their removal or deportation. The courts in the United Kingdom have ruled that this power of detention can only be exercised during the period necessary, in all the circumstances of the particular case, to effect removal and that, if it becomes clear that removal is not going to be possible within a reasonable time, detention will be unlawful (Rv Governor of Durham Prison, ex parte Singh [1984] All ER 983).

Article 9 of the Covenant

In some cases, where the intention remains to remove or deport a person on national security grounds, continued detention may not be consistent with Article 9 of the Covenant. This may be the case, for example, if the person has established that removal to their own country might result in treatment contrary to Article 7 of the Covenant. In such circumstances, irrespective of the gravity of the threat to national security posed by the person concerned, it is well established that the international obligations of the United Kingdom prevent removal or deportation to a place where there is a real risk that the person will suffer treatment contrary to that article. If no alternative destination is immediately available then removal or deportation may not, for the time being, be possible even though the ultimate intention remains to remove or deport the person once satisfactory arrangements can be made. In addition, it may not be possto prosecute the person for a criminal offence given the strict rules on the admissibility of evidence in the criminal justice system of the United Kingdom and the high standard of proof required.

Derogation under Article 4 of the Covenant

The Government has considered whether the exercise of the extended power to detain contained in the Anti-terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001 may be inconsistent with the obligations under Article 9 of the Covenant. To the extent that the exercise of the extended power may be inconsistent with the United Kingdom's obligations under Article 9, the Government has decided to avail itself of the right of derogation conferred by Article 4(1) of the Covenant and will continue to do so until further notice.]

15 March 2005

(Dated 15 March 2005)

"The provisions referred to in the 18 December 2001 notification, namely the extended power of arrest and detention in the Anti-terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001, ceased to operate on 14 March 2005. Accordingly, the notification is withdrawn as from that date, and the Government of the United Kingdom confirm that the relevant provisions of the Covenant will again be executed as from then."

URUGUAY

30 July 1979

[The Government of Uruguay] has the honour to request that the requirement laid down in article 4 (3) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights should be deemed to have been formally fulfilled with regard to the existence and maintenance in Uruguay of a public emergency as referred to in article 4 (1).

This emergency situation, the nature and consequences of which match the description given in article 4, namely that they threaten the life of the nation, is a matter of universal knowledge, and the present communication might thus appear superfluous in so far as the provision of substantive information is concerned.

This issue has been the subject of countless official statements at both the regional and the international level.

Nonetheless, [the Government of Uruguay] wishes both to comply formally with the above-mentioned requirement and to reiterate that the emergency measures which it has taken, and which comply strictly with the requirements of article 4 (2), are designed precisely to achieve genuine, effective and lasting protection of human rights, the observance and promotion of which are the essence of our existence as an independent and sovereign nation.

Notwithstanding what has been stated above, the information referred to in article 4 (3) concerning the nature and duration of the emergency measures will be provided in more detailed form when the report referred to in article 40 of the Covenant is submitted, so that the scope and evolution of these measures can be fully understood.

Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

12 April 1989

(Dated 17 March 1989)

Establishment of emergency measures and derogation from articles 9, 12, 17, 19 and 21 throughout Venezuela. The notification stipulates that derogation was effected due to a series of serious breaches of the peace having taken place throughout Caracas and in other cities in the country and outbursts of violence, acts of vandalism and violations of the security of Venezuelan individuals and households, leading to loss of life and the destruction of much property, thus causing a further deterioration in the economic situation of the country.

(Dated 31 March 1989)

Re-establishment as from 22 March 1989 of the constitutional safeguards which had been suspended as stated in the previous notification of 17 March 1989.

5 February 1992

(Dated 4 February 1992)

Temporary suspension of certain constitutional guarantees throughout Venezuela with a view to facilitating the full restoration of public order throughout the national territory.

The Government of Venezuela specified that "the measures were made necessary after criminal attempt was made to assassinate the President of the Republic with the aim of upsetting the rule of law and undermining the constitutional order of the Re public thereby constituting an attempt against the achievements of the Venezuelan people over more than three decades of fully democratic government".

The constitutional guarantees suspended in Venezuela relate to the rights provided for in articles 9, 12, 17, 19 and 21. The right to strike was also temporarily suspended.

24 February 1992

(Dated 21 February 1992)

Restoration, as from 17 February 1991, of the guarantees provided for under articles 12 and 19 of the Covenant and also of the right to strike.

6 May 1992

(Dated 30 April 1992)

Restoration, as from 21 February 1991, of the guarantees provided for in articles 9, 17 and 21 of the Covenant, thereby fully ending the state of emergency declared on 4 February 1992.

2 December 1992

(Dated 30 November 1992)

On 27 November 1992, certain constitutional guarantees relating to the rights provided for in articles 9, 17, 19 and 21 of the Covenant have been suspended in Venezuela.

This measure was made necessary after a group of civil subversives in connivance with a small military squad took over Palo Negro air base in the city of Maracay, Aragua State, and Francisco de Miranda Base in the city of Caracas, which services as Headquarters of the Air Force Command, thereby threatening the democratic system.

On 28 November 1992, restoration, as from that date, of the rights provided for in article 21 of the Covenant, so as to allow public electioneering in contemplation of the elections to be held on 6 December 1992.

5 March 1993

Restoration, pursuant to Decree No. 2764 of 16 January 1993, of rights regarding personal liberty corresponding to articles 9 (1) and 11 of the Covenant throughout the national territory. Rights regarding liberty and security of person as well as the inviolability of the home and the right to demonstrate had been restored as from 22 December 1992.

Restoration, pursuant to Decree No. 2672 of 1 December 1992 of certain rights which had been suspended by Decree No. 2668 of 27 November 1992.

Suspension, pursuant to Decree 2765 of 16 January 1993, of certain rights in the State of Sucre as a result of a breach of the peace in that State. These rights, corresponding to articles 12 (1) and 21, were restored by Decree No. 2780 on 25 January 1993.

7 July 1994

(Dated 29 June 1994)

By Decree No. 241 of 27 June 1994, suspension of certain constitutional guarantees in view of the fact that the economic and financial situation of the country has created circumstances liable to endanger public order.

Derogation from the provisions of articles 9, 12 and 17 of the Covenant.

1 September 1995

(Dated 18 July 1995)

By Decree No. 739 of 6 July 1995, restoratif the constitutional guarantees, suspended by Decree No. 241 of 27 June 1994 *[see notification received on 7 July 1994]* , throughout the national territory, except in the autonomous municipalities of Rosario de Perijá and Catatumbo, State of Zulia; García de Hevia, Pedro María Ureña, Bolivar, Panamericano and Fernández Feo, State of Táchira; Páez, Pedro Camejo and Rómulo Gallegos, State of Apure; and Atures, Atuana, Manapiare, Atabapo, Alto Orinoco and Guainía, State of Amazonas. The Government considers that the situation in these border municipalities, where the theatre of conflict and the theatre of operations No. 1 were decreed, requires that, in the interest of protecting its borders, the above guarantees remain suspended.

22 March 1999

(Dated 3 March 1999)

Resoration of the guarantees provided for in articles 9, 12 and 17 of the Covenant, suspended by Decree No. 739 of 6 July 1995 . *[See notification received on 1 September 1995.]*

12 April 1989

(Dated 17 March 1989)

Establishment of emergency measures and derogation from articles 9, 12, 17, 19 and 21 throughout Venezuela. The notification stipulates that derogation was effected due to a series of serious breaches of the peace having taken place throughout Caracas and in other cities in the country and outbursts of violence, acts of vandalism and violations of the security of Venezuelan individuals and households, leading to loss of life and the destruction of much property, thus causing a further deterioration in the economic situation of the country.

(Dated 31 March 1989)

Re-establishment as from 22 March 1989 of the constitutional safeguards which had been suspended as stated in the previous notification of 17 March 1989.

5 February 1992

(Dated 4 February 1992)

Temporary suspension of certain constitutional guarantees throughout Venezuela with a view to facilitating the full restoration of public order throughout the national territory.

The Government of Venezuela specified that "the measures were made necessary after criminal attempt was made to assassinate the President of the Republic with the aim of upsetting the rule of law and undermining the constitutional order of the Re public thereby constituting an attempt against the achievements of the Venezuelan people over more than three decades of fully democratic government".

The constitutional guarantees suspended in Venezuela relate to the rights provided for in articles 9, 12, 17, 19 and 21. The right to strike was also temporarily suspended.

24 February 1992

(Dated 21 February 1992)

Restoration, as from 17 February 1991, of the guarantees provided for under articles 12 and 19 of the Covenant and also of the right to strike.

6 May 1992

(Dated 30 April 1992)

Restoration, as from 21 February 1991, of the guarantees provided for in articles 9, 17 and 21 of the Covenant, thereby fully ending the state of emergency declared on 4 February 1992.

2 December 1992

(Dated 30 November 1992)

On 27 November 1992, certain constitutional guarantees relating to the rights provided for in articles 9, 17, 19 and 21 of the Covenant have been suspended in Venezuela.

This measure was made necessary after a group of civil subversives in connivance with a small military squad took over Palo Negro air base in the city of Maracay, Aragua State, and Francisco de Miranda Base in the city of Caracas, which services as Headquarters of the Air Force Command, thereby threatening the democratic system.

On 28 November 1992, restoration, as from that date, of the rights provided for in article 21 of the Covenant, so as to allow public electioneering in contemplation of the elections to be held on 6 December 1992.

5 March 1993

Restoration, pursuant to Decree No. 2764 of 16 January 1993, of rights regarding personal liberty corresponding to articles 9 (1) and 11 of the Covenant throughout the national territory. Rights regarding liberty and security of person as well as the inviolability of the home and the right to demonstrate had been restored as from 22 December 1992.

Restoration, pursuant to Decree No. 2672 of 1 December 1992 of certain rights which had been suspended by Decree No. 2668 of 27 November 1992.

Suspension, pursuant to Decree 2765 of 16 January 1993, of certain rights in the State of Sucre as a result of a breach of the peace in that State. These rights, corresponding to articles 12 (1) and 21, were restored by Decree No. 2780 on 25 January 1993.

7 July 1994

(Dated 29 June 1994)

By Decree No. 241 of 27 June 1994, suspension of certain constitutional guarantees in view of the fact that the economic and financial situation of the country has created circumstances liable to endanger public order.

Derogation from the provisions of articles 9, 12 and 17 of the Covenant.

1 September 1995

(Dated 18 July 1995)

By Decree No. 739 of 6 July 1995, restoratif the constitutional guarantees, suspended by Decree No. 241 of 27 June 1994 *[see notification received on 7 July 1994]* , throughout the national territory, except in the autonomous municipalities of Rosario de Perijá and Catatumbo, State of Zulia; García de Hevia, Pedro María Ureña, Bolivar, Panamericano and Fernández Feo, State of Táchira; Páez, Pedro Camejo and Rómulo Gallegos, State of Apure; and Atures, Atuana, Manapiare, Atabapo, Alto Orinoco and Guainía, State of Amazonas. The Government considers that the situation in these border municipalities, where the theatre of conflict and the theatre of operations No. 1 were decreed, requires that, in the interest of protecting its borders, the above guarantees remain suspended.

22 March 1999

(Dated 3 March 1999)

Resoration of the guarantees provided for in articles 9, 12 and 17 of the Covenant, suspended by Decree No. 739 of 6 July 1995 . *[See notification received on 1 September 1995.]*

YUGOSLAVIA (FORMER)[1]

Territorial Application

Participant	***Date of receipt of the notification***	***Territories***
Netherlands[29]	11 Dec 1978	Netherlands Antilles
Portugal[4]	27 Apr 1993	Macau
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[6,40]	20 May 1976	Belize, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and Dependencies, Gibraltar, Gilbert Islands, Guernsey, Hong Kong, Isle of Man, Bailiwick of Jersey, Montserrat, Pitcairn Island, St. Helena and Dependencies, Solomon Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands and Tuvalu

---

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convenant on 8 August 1967 and 2 June 1971, respectively. It will be recalled that the former Yugoslavia had deposited the following notifications under article 4(3) of the Covenant (Derogations), on the dates indicated hereinafter:

17 April 1989 (Dated 14 April 1989)

Derogation from articles 12 and 21 of the Covenant in the Autonomous Province of Kosovo as from 28 March 1989. The measure became necessary because of disorders which led to the loss of human lives and which had threatened the established social system. This situation which represented a general danger was a threat to the rights, freedoms and security of all the citizens of the Province regardless of nationality.

30 May 1989 (Dated 29 May 1989)

Termination of the derogation from the provisions of article 12 of the Covenant in the Autonomous Province of Kosovo as from 21 May 1989. The right of public assembly [article 21] continues to be temporarily suspended but only as concerns demonstrations. This is aimed at protecting public order, peace and the rights of citizens, regardless of nationality.

20 March 1990 (Dated 19 March 1990)

As of 21 February 1990 and owing to the escalation of disorders which had led to the loss of human lives, the movement of persons in Kosovo was prohibited from 9 PM to 4 AM, thereby derogating from article 12; and that public assembly was prohibited for the purpose of demonstration, thereby derogating from article 21. The Government of Yugoslavia further indicated that the measure derogating from article 12 had been terminated as of 10 March 1990.

26 April 1990 (Dated 24 April 1990)

Termination of the state of emergency with effect from 18 April 1990.

See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] Although Democratic Kampuchea had signed both [the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights] on 17 October 1980, the Government of Cambodia deposited an instrument of accession to the said Covenants.

[3] The signature was effected by Democratic Kampuchea. In this regard the Secretary-General received, on 5 November 1980, the following communication from the Government of Mongolia:

"The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that only the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea as the sole authentic and lawful representative of the Kampuchean people has the right to assume international obligations on behalf of the Kampuchean people. Therefore the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that the signature of the Human Rights Covenants by the representative of the so-called Democratic Kampuchea, a régime that ceased to exist as a result of the people's revolution in Kampuchea, is null and void.

"The signing of the Human Rights Covenants by an individual, whose régime during its short period of reign in Kampuchea had exterminated about 3 million people and had thus grossly violated the elementary norms of human rights, each and every provision of the Human Rights Covenants is a regrettable precedence, which discredits the noble aims and lofty principles of the United Nations Charter, the very spirit of the above-mentioned Covenants, gravely impairs the prestige of the United Nations."

Thereafter, similar communications were received from the Government of the following States on the dates indicated and their texts were circulated as depositary notifications or, at the request of the States concerned, as official documents of the General Assembly (A/33/781 and A/35/784):

Participant:	***Date of receipt:***		
German Democratic Republic	11	Dec	1980
Poland	12	Dec	1980
Ukraine	16	Dec	1980
Hungary	19	Jan	1981
Bulgaria	29	Jan	1981
Belarus	18	Feb	1981
Russian Federation	18	Feb	1981
Czechoslovakia	10	Mar	1981

[4] On 3 December 1999, the Government of China notified the Secretary-General that:

1. The application of the Covenant, and its article 1 in particular, to the Macao Special Administrative Region shall not affect the status of Macao as defined in the Joint Declaration and in the Basic Law.

2. The provisions of the Covenant which are applicable to the Macao Special Administrative Region shall be implemented in Macao through legislation of the Macao Special Administrative Region.

The residents of Macao shall not be restricted in the rights and freedoms that they are entitled to, unless otherwise provided for by law. In case of restrictions, they shall not contravene the provisions of the Covenant that are applicable to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

Within the above ambit, the Government of the People's Republic of China will assume the responsibility for the international rights and obligations that place on a Party to the Covenant.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Macao from China and Portugal (see note 3 under “China” and note 1 under “Portugal” regarding Macao in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Covenant with the statement made by China will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[5] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 5 October 1967. See note 1 under “China” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

With reference to the above-mentioned signature, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Representatives of Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia, stating that their Governments did not recognize the said signature as valid since the only Government authorized to represent China and to assume obligations on its behalf was the Government of the People's Republic of China.

In letters addressed to the Secretary-General in regard to the above-mentioned communications, the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations stated that the Republic of China, a sovereign State and Member of the United Nations, had attended the twenty-first regular session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and contributed to the formulation of, and signed the Covenants and the Optional Protocol concerned, and that "any statements or reservations relating to the above-mentioned Covenants and Optional Protocol that are incompatible with or derogatory to the legitimate position of the Government of the Republic of China shall in no way affect the rights and obligations of the Republic of China under these Covenants and Optional Protocol".

[6] With regard to the application of the Covenant to Hong Kong, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from the United Kingdom and China (see note 2 under “United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland” and note 2 under “China” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Covenant will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

[7] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 7 October 1968 and 23 December 1975, respectively, with reservations and declarations. For the texts of the reservations and declarations made upon signature and ratification, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 999, pp. 283 and 289.

Subsequently, on 12 March 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia had declared the following:

[The Czech and Slovak Federal Republic] recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee established on the basis of article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

Further, on 7 June 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia had made the following objection:

"The Government of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic considers the reservations entered by the Government of the Republic of Korea to the provisions of paragraphs 5 and 7 of article 14 and article 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. In the opinion of the Czechoslovak Government these reservations are in contradiction to the generally recognized principle of international law according to which a state cannot invoke the provisions of its own internal law as justification for its failure to perform a treaty.

"Therefore, the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic does not recognize these reservations as valid. Nevertheless the present declaration will not be deemed to be an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic and the Republic of Korea."

See also note 1 under “Czech Republic” and note 1 under “Slovakia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] On 25 August 1997, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea a notification of withdrawal from the Covenant, dated 23 August 1997.

As the Covenant does not contain a withdrawal provision, the Secretariat of the United Nations forwarded on 23 September 1997 an aide-mémoire to the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea explaining the legal position arising from the above notification.

As elaborated in this aide-mémoire, the Secretary-General is of the opinion that a withdrawal from the Covenant would not appear possible unless all States Parties to the Covenant agree with such a withdrawal.

The above notification of withdrawal and the aide-mémoire were duly circulated to all States Parties under cover of C.N.467.1997.TREATIES-10 of 12 November 1997.

[9] See note 1 under “Germany” regarding Berlin (West) in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Covenant with reservations and declarations, on 23 March 1973 and 8 November 1973, respectively. For the text of the reservations and declarations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 999, p. 294. See also note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[11] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[12] See note 1 under “New Zealand” regarding Tokelau in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[13] With respect to the interpretative declarations made by Algeria the Secretary-General received, on 25 October 1990, from the Government of Germany the following declaration:

[The Federal Republic of Germany] interprets the declaration under paragraph 2 to mean that the latter is not intended to eliminate the obligation of Algeria to ensure that the rights guaranteed in article 8, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and in article 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights may be restricted only for the reasons mentioned in the said articles and that such restrictions shall be prescribed by law.

It interprets the declaration under paragraph 4 to mean that Algeria, by referring to its domestic legal system, does not intend to restrict its obligation to ensure through appropriate steps equality of rights and responsibilities of spouses as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution.

[14] By a communication received on 6 November 1984, the Government of Australia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservations and declarations made upon ratification with regard to articles 2 and 50, 17, 19, 25 and to partially withdraw its reservations to articles 10 and 14. For the text of the reservations and declarations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1197, p. 411.

[15] The reservation was lodged with the Secretary-General on 4 December 2006 by Bahrain, following its accession to the Covenant on 20 September 2006.

In keeping with the depositary practice followed in similar cases, the Secretary-General proposed to receive the reservation in question for deposit in the absence of any objection on the part of any of the Contracting States, either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged, within a period of 12 months from the date of the relevant depositary notification. In the absence of any such objection, the above reservation would be accepted in deposit upon the expiration of the above-stipulated 12 month period, that is on 28 December 2007.

In view of the below objections, the Secretary-General did not accept the reservation made by Bahrain in deposit. The Secretary-General received the following objections on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Netherlands (27 July 2007):

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Since the reservations were made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations were too late and therefore inconsistent with article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Furthermore, the reservation with respect to articles 3, 18 and 23 of the Covenant is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that with this reservation the application of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is made subject to the Islamic Shariah. This makes it unclear to what extent the Kingdom of Bahrain considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Governmnt of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty is not permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to all of the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain since they were made after accession, and specifically objects to the content of the reservation on articles 3, 18 and 23 made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Kingdom of Bahrain."

Latvia (13 August 2007):

"The Government of the Republic of Latvia has noted that the reservation made by the Kingdom of Bahrain is submitted to the Secretary General on 4 December 2006, but the consent to be bound by the said Covenant by accession is expressed on 20 September 2006. In accordance with Article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties reservations might be made upon signature, ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. Taking into considerations the aforementioned, the Government of the Republic of Latvia considers that the said reservation is not in force since its submission."

Portugal (29 August 2007):

"The Government of the Portuguese Republic has carefully examined the reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). The Government of the Portuguese Republic notes that the reservations were made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant and is of the view that the practice of late reservations should be discouraged.

According to the first part of the reservation, the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain interprets the provisions of articles 3, 18 and 23 as not affecting in any way the prescriptions of the Islamic Shariah. These provisions deal namely with the questions of equality between men and women, freedom of thought, conscience and religion and the protection of family and marriage.

Portugal considers that these articles are fundamental provisions of the Covenant and the first reservation makes it unclear to what extent the Kingdom of Bahrain considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant, raises concerns as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the object and purpose of the Covenant and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international law.

It is in the common interest of all States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic, therefore, objects to the above mentioned reservation made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the ICCPR.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Portugal and Bahrain."

Czech Republic (12 September 2007):

"The Government of the Czech Republic has carefully examined the contents of reservation made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted on 16 December 1966, in respect of Articles 3, 18 and 23 thereof. Since the reservation was made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, the Government of the Czech Republic considers that the reservation was too late and therefore inconsistent with article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Furthermore the Government of the Czech Republic is of the opinion that the aforementioned reservation is in contradiction with the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a State party to a treaty may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform according to the obligations set out by the treaty. Furthermore, the reservation consists of a general reference to the Constitution without specifying its content and as such does not clearly define to other Parties to the Covenant the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Covenant.

The Government of the Czech Republic recalls that it is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Czech Republic therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Czech Republic and the Kingdom of Bahrain, without the Kingdom of Bahrain benefiting from its reservation."

Estonia (12 September 2007):

"The Government of Estonia has carefully examined the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Since the reservations were made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, the Government of Estonia considers that the reservations were late and therefore inconsistent with international customary law as codified into Article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Furthermore, the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to Articles 3, 18 and 23 of the Covenant make a general reference to the prescriptions of the Islamic Shariah. The Government of Estonia is of the view that in the absence of any further clarification, the reservation makes it unclear to what extent the Kingdom of Bahrain considers itself bound by the obligations of the Convention and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

Therefore, the Government of Estonia objects to all of the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights since they were made after the accession, and specifically objects to the content of the reservations to Articles 3, 18 and 23.

Nevertheless, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as between Estonia and the Kingdom of Bahrain."

Canada (18 September 2007):

"The Government of Canada has carefully examined the declaration made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain upon acceding to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, in accordance with which the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain 'interprets the Provisions of Article 3, 18 and 23 as not affecting in any way the prescriptions of the Islamic Shariah'.

The Government of Canada notes that these declarations constitute in reality reservations and that they should have been lodged at the time of accession by Bahrain to the Covenant.

The Government of Canada considers that by making the interpretation of articles 3, 18 and 23 of the Covenant subject to the prescriptions of the Islamic Shariah, the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain is formulating reservations with a general, indeterminate scope, such that they make it impossible to identify the modifications to obligations under the Covenant, which they purport to introduce and they do not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State haaccepted the obligations of the Convention.

The Government of Canada notes that the reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain, addressing some of the most essential provisions of the Covenant, and aiming to exclude the obligations under those provisions, are in contradiction with the object and purpose of the Covenant. In addition, article 18 of the Covenant is among the provisions from which no derogation is allowed, according to article 4 of the Covenant.

The Government of Canada therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain. This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Covenant between Canada and the Kingdom of Bahrain."

Australia (18 September 2007):

"The Government of Australia has examined the reservation made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. As the reservations were made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, the Government of Australia considers that the reservations were late and therefore inconsistent with article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

The Government of Australia considers that the reservation with respect to articles 3, 18 and 23 of the Covenant is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. The Government of Australia recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty is not permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Australia considers that the Kingdom of Bahrain is, through this reservation, purporting to make the application of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights subject to Islamic Shariah law. As a result, it is unclear to what extent the Kingdom of Bahrain considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Australia recalls the general principle of treaty interpretation, codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal lawas justification for its failure to perform a treaty.

Further, as regards the reservation with respect to article 18, the Government of Australia recalls that according to article 4 (2) of the Covenant, no derogation of article 18 is permitted.

The Government of Australia objects to all of the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain as they were made after accession, and specifically objects to the content of the reservation on article 3, 18 and 23 made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Australia and the Kingdom of Bahrain."

Ireland (27 September 2007):

"The Government of Ireland has examined the reservations made on 4 December 2006 by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of Ireland notes that the reservation was not made by the Kingdom of Bahrain at the time of its accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights on 20 September 2006.

The Government of Ireland further notes that the Kingdom of Bahrain subjects application of Articles 3, 18 and 23 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights to the prescriptions of the Islamic Shariah. The Government of Ireland is of the view that a reservation which consists of a general reference to religious law may cast doubts on the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the Covenant. The Government of Ireland is furthermore of the view that such a general reservation may undermine the basis of international treaty law and is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Ireland also notes that the Kingdom of Bahrain does not consider that Article 9 (5) detracts from its right to layout the basis and rules of obtaining the compensation mentioned therein. The Government of Ireland is of the view that a reservation which is vague and general in nature as to the basis and rules referred to may similarly make it unclear to what extent the reserving State considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant and cast doubts on the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the Covenant.

The Government of Ireland further notes that the Kingdom of Bahrain considers that no obligation arises from Article 14 (7) beyond those contained in Article 10 of its national Criminal Law. The Government of Ireland is of the view that such a reservation may cast doubts on the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the Covenant and may undermine the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of Ireland therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Ireland and the Kingdom of Bahrain."

Italy (1 November 2007):

"The Government of Italy has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain to Articles 3, 18 and 23 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of Italy considers that the reservation of the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain, whereby it excludes any interpretation of the provisions of Articles 3, 18 and 23, which would affect the prescription of the Islamic Shariah, does not clearly define the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligation under these Articles.

This reservation raises serious doubts about the real extent of the commitment undertaken by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain and is capable of contravening the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Italy therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain. This objection, however, shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Government of Italy and the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain."

Poland (3 December 2007)

"The Government of the Republic of Poland has examined the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain after its accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, opened for signature at New York on 19 December 1966, hereinafter called the Covenant, in respect of article 3, article 9 paragraph 5, article 14 paragraph 7, article 18 and article 23.

The Government of the Republic of Poland considers that the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain are so called late reservations, since they were made after the date of accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant. Therefore the reservations are inconsistent with article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which provides for the possibility of formulation of reservations only when signing, ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to a treaty.

Furthermore, the Government of the Republic of Poland considers that as a result of reservations with respect to articles 3, 18 and 23 of the Covenant, the implementation of provisions of these articles by the Kingdom of Bahrain is made subject to the prescriptions of the Islamic Shariah, with the result that the extent to which the Kingdom of Bahrain has accepted the obligations of the said articles of the Covenant is not defined precisely enough for the other State Parties. The Republic of Poland considers that these reservations lead to differentiation in enjoyment of the rights warranted in the Covenant, which is incompatible with the purpose and object of the Covenant and therefore not permitted (article 19 c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties).

The Government of the Republic of Poland therefore objects to the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain.

However this objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Poland and the Kingdom of Bahrain."

Sweden (3 December 2007)

"The Government of Sweden notes that the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain were made after its accession to the Covenant. Since these reservations were formulated late they are to be considered inconsistent with the general principle of pacta sunt servanda as well as customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Furthermore the Government of Sweden notes that the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain has made a reservation with respect to articles 3, 18 and 23 giving precedence to the provisions of Islamic Shariah and national legislation over the application of the provisions of the Covenant. This reservation does not, in the opinion of the Government of Sweden, clearly specify the extent of the derogation by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain from the provisions in question and raises serious doubts as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Sweden would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties, to which they have chosen to become a party, are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to all of the reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, as they were made after accession, and specifically objects to the content of the reservations on articles 3, 18 and 23 made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, and considers them null and void.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant [in] its entirety between the Kingdom of Bahrain and Sweden, without the Kingdom of Bahrain benefiting from its reservations."

Hungary (4 December 2007)

"The Government of the Republic of Hungary has carefully examined the contents of the reservation made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted on 16 December 1966, in respect of Articles 3, 18 and 23 thereof. Since the reservation was made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, the Government of the Republic of Hungary considers that the reservation was too late and therefore inconsistent with article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Furthermore the Government of the Republic of Hungary is of the opinion that the aforementioned reservation is in contradiction with the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a State party to a treaty may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform according to the obligations set out by the treaty. Furthermore, the reservation consists of a general reference to the Constitution without specifying its content and as such does not clearly define to other Parties to the Covenant the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Covenant.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary recalls that it is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Hungary and the Kingdom of Bahrain."

Mexico (13 December 2007)

The Permanent Mission of Mexico to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Treaty Section of the Office of Legal Affairs and has the honour to refer to the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights on 20 December 2006 and to the reservations that it made to various provisions, including articles 3, 18 and 23.

In that regard, the Permanent Mission of Mexico would like to state that the Government of Mexico has studied the content of Bahrain's reservation and is of the view that it should be considered invalid because it is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The reserve formulated, if applied, would have the unavoidable result of making implementation of the articles mentioned subject to the provisions of Islamic Shariah, which would constitute discrimination in the enjoyment and exercise of the rights enshrined in the Covenant; this is contrary to all the articles of this international instrument. The principles of the equality of men and women and non-discrimination are enshrined in the preamble and article 2, paragraph 1 of the Covenant and in the preamble and Article 1, paragraph 3 of the Charter of the United Nations.

The objection of the Government of Mexico to the reservation in question should not be interpreted as an impediment to the entry into force of the Covenant between Mexico and the Kingdom of Bahrain.

Slovakia (18 December 2007):

"The Government of Slovakia has carefully examined the content of the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain upon its accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of Slovakia is of the opinion that the reservation of the Kingdom of Bahrain, whereby it excludes any interpretation of the provisions of Articles 3, 18 and 23, which would affect the prescription of the Islamic Shariah, does not clearly define the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligation under these Articles. This reservation is too general and raises serious doubts as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the object and the purpose of the Covenant.

For these reasons, the Government of Slovakia objects to the above mentioned reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain upon its accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Slovakia and the Kingdom of Bahrain. The Covenant enters into force in its entirety between Slovakia and the Kingdom of Bahrain without the Kingdom of Bahrain benefiting from its reservations."

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (27 December 2007):

"The United Kingdom objects to Bahrain's reservations as they were made after the date of Bahrain's accession to the Covenant.

The United Kingdom further objects to the substance of Bahrain's first reservation, to Articles 3, 18 and 23. In the view of the United Kingdom a reservation should clearly define for the other States Parties to the Covenant the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Covenant. A reservation which consists of a general reference to a system of law without specifying its contents does not do so.

These objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Kingdom of Bahrain. However on account of their lateness the reservations shall have no effect as between Bahrain and the United Kingdom."

[16] On 30 September 1992, the Government of Belarus notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification. For the text of the declaration regarding article 48 (1) so withdrawn, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 999, p. 282.

[17] In a notification received on 14 September 1998, the Government of Belgium informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with regard to articles 2, 3 and 25 made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1312, p. 328.

[18] With regard to the reservation made by Botswana upon signature and confirmed upon ratification, the Secretary-General received, from the following States, communications on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Austria (17 October 2001):

"Austria has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Botswana upon signature of the 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and confirmed upon ratification, regarding Articles 7 and 12 para. 3 of the Covenant.

The fact that Botswana is making the said articles subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of existing national legislation, in the absence of further clarification raises doubts as to the commitment of Botswana to the object and purpose of the Covenant. According to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. In Austria's view the reservation in question is therefore inadmissible to the extent that its application could negatively affect the compliance by Botswana with its obligations under Articles 7 and 12 para. 3 of the Covenant.

For these reasons, Austria objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Botswana to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant in its entirety between Botswana and Austria, without Botswana benefiting from its reservation."

Italy (20 December 2001):

"The Government of the Italian Republic has examined the reservations made by the Republic of Botswana upn signature of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and confirmed upon ratification, regarding articles 7 and 12, paragraph 3 of the Covenant.

The Government of the Italian Republic notes that the aforesaid articles of the Covenant are being made subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of exsing legislation in Botswana. The Government of the Italian Republic is of the view that, in the absence of further clarification, these reservations referring to international legislation raise doubts as to the commitment of Botswana to fulfill its obligation under the Covenant.

The Government of the Italian Republic considers these reservations to be incompatible with the object and the purpose of the Covenant according to article 19 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the law of treaties. These reservations do not fall within the rule of article 20, paragraph 5, and can be objected at any time.

Therefore, the Italian Government objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Republic of Botswana to the Covenant.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Italy and Botswana".

[19] In communications received on 29 March 1985 and 26 July 1990, the Government of Finland notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservations made upon ratification with respect to articles 13 and 14 (1) (the notification indicates that the withdrawal was effected because the relevant provisions of the Finnish legislation have been amended as to correspond fully to articles 13 and 14 (1) of the Covenant), and with respect to articles 9 (3) and 14 (3) (d), respectively. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 999, p. 291.

[20] In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 23 April 1982 from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, the following declaration with regard to that declaration made by France concerning article 27 of the said Covenant:

The Federal Government refers to the declaration on article 27 made by the French Government and stresses in this context the great importance attaching to the rights guaranteed by article 27. It interprets the French declaration as meaning that the Constitution of the French Republic already fully guarantees the individual rights protected by article 27.

[21] In a communication received on 22 March 1988, the Government of France notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw, with effect from that date, its reservation with regard to article 19 made upon accession to the said Covenant. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1202, p. 395.

[22] In a communication received on that same date, the Government of Germany indicated that it wishes to call attention to the reservations made by the Federal Republic of Germany upon ratification of the Covenant with regard to articles 19, 21 and 22 in conjunction with articles 2 (1), 14 (3), 14 (5) and 15 (1).

[23] On 18 October 1993, the Government of Iceland notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw as of 18 October 1993, the reservation to paragraph 3(a) of article 8, made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1144, p. 386.

[24] On 12 April 1994 and 24 August 1998, respectively, the Government of Ireland notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the declaration with respect to article 6 (5), on the one hand, and the reservations made to articles 14 (6) and 23 (4), on the other, made upon ratification. For the text of the declaration and reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1551, p. 352.

On 26 January 2009, the Government of Ireland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation with respect to article 14 made upon ratification, which read as follows: “Ireland reserves the right to have minor offences against military law dealt with summarily in accordance with current procedures, which may not, in all respects, conform to the requirements of article 14 of the Covenant.”

[25] With reference to the ratification of the above Covenant by Italy, the Government of Italy informed the Secretary-General, by a notification received on 20 December 2005, of its decision to withdraw the following reservations in respect of articles 9 (5), 12 (4) and 14 (5), made upon ratification of the Covenant:

Article 9, paragraph 5

The Italian Republic, considering that the expression "unlawful arrest or detention" contained in article 9, paragraph 5, could give rise to differences of interpretation, declares that it interprets the aforementioned expression as referring exclusively to cases of arrest or detention contrary to the provisions of article 9, paragraph 1.

Article 12, paragraph 4

Article 12, paragraph 4, shall be without prejudice to the application of transitional provision XIII of the Italian Constitution, respecting prohibition of the entry into and sojourn in the national territory of certain members of the House of Savoy.

Article 14, paragraph 5

Article 14, paragraph 5, shall be without prejudice to the application of existing Italian provisions which, in accordance with the Constitution of the Italian Republic, govern the conduct, at one level only, of proceedings instituted before the Constitutional Court in respect of charges brought against the President of the Republic and its Ministers.

[26] On 28 April 2000, the Government of Liechtenstein informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation to article 20 paragraph 2 of the Covenant made upon accession. The text of the reservation read as follows:

“The Principality of Liechtenstein reserves the right not to adopt further measures to ban propaganda for war, which is prohibited by article 20, paragraph 1 of the Covenant. The Principality of Liechtenstein reserves the right to adopt a criminal provision which will take into account the requirements of article 20, paragraph 2, on the occasion of its possible accession to the Convention of 21 December 1965 on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.”

[27] With regard to the reservation made by Maldives upon accession, the Secretary-General received, from the following States, communications on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Italy (1 November 2007):

"The Government of Italy has examined the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives with respect to Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of Italy considers that, by providing that the application of Article 18 is without prejudice to the Constitution of the Republic of Maldives, the reservation does not clearly define the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligation under that Article. This reservation raises serious doubts about the real extent of the commitment undertaken by the Republic of Maldives and is capable of contravening the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Italy therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservation made by the Republic of Maldives.

This objection, however, shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Government of Italy and the Republic of Maldives."

Slovakia (21 December 2007):

“The Government of Slovakia has carefully examined the content of the reservations made by the Republic of Maldives upon its accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of Slovakia is of the view that general reservation made by the Republic of Maldives that (The application of the principles set out in Article 18 of the Covenant shall be without prejudice to the Constitution of the Republic of Maldives(is too general and does not clearly specify the extent of the obligations under the Covenant for the Republic of Maldives.

According to the Maldivian legal system, mainly based on the principles of Islamic law, the reservation raises doubts as to the commitment of of the Republic of Maldives to its obligations under the Covenant, essential for the fulfillment of its object and purpose.

The Government of Slovakia objects for these reasons to the above mentioned reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Maldives upon its accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

[28] On 15 March 2002, the Government of Mexico notified the Secretary-General of a partial withdrawal of its reservation to article 25 (b) made upon accession. The reservation made upon accession read as follows:

Article 25, subparagraph (b):

The Government of Mexico also makes a reservation to this provision, since article 130 of the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States provides that ministers of religion shall have neither an active nor a passive vote, nor the right to form associations for political purposes.

[29] In a communication received on 20 December 1983, the Government of the Netherlands notified the Secretary-General that it was withdrawing its reservation with regard to article 25 (c). The text of the reservation read as follows:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not accept this provision in the case of the Netherlands Antilles."

See also note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[30] In a notification received by the Secretary-General on 12 December 1979, the Government of Norway withdrew the reservation formulated simultaneously in respect of article 6 (4).

[31] On 15 March 1991, 19 January 1993 and 2 April 2007, respectively, the Government of the Republic of Korea notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservations made in respect of article 23 (4) (with effect from 15 March 1991), of article 14 (7) (with effect from 21 January 1993) and of article 14 (5) (with effect from 2 April 2007) made upon accession.

[32] On 16 October 1995, the Government of Switzerland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation to article 20, paragraph 2 made upon accession, which reads as follows:

Switzerland reserves the right to adopt a criminal provision which will take into account the requirements of article 20, paragraph 2, on the occasion of its forthcoming accession to the 1966 International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

Further, on 12 January 2004, the Government of Switzerland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation to article 14, paragraph 3, sub-paragraphs (d) and (f) made upon accession, which reads as follows:

The guarantee of free legal assistance assigned by the court and of the free assistance of an interpreter does not definitively exempt the beneficiary from defraying the resulting costs.

Further, on 1 May 2007, the Government of Switzerland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservations to article 10, paragraph 2 (b) and article 14, paragraph 1 and 5 made upon accession, which reads as follows:

(a) Reservation concerning article 10, paragraph 2 (b):

The separation of accused juvenile persons from adults is not unconditionally guaranteed.

(b) Reservations concerning article 14, paragraph 1:

The principle of a public hearing is not applicable to proceedings which involve a dispute relating to civil rights and obligations or to the merits of the prosecution's case in a criminal matter; these, in accordance with cantonal laws, are held before an administrative authority. The principle that any judgement rendered shall be made public is adhered to without prejudice to the cantonal laws on civil and criminal procedure, which provide that a judgement shall not be rendered at a public hearing, but shall be transmitted to the parties in writing.

The guarantee of a fair trial has as its sole purpose, where disputes relating to civil right and obligations are concerned, to ensure final judicial review of the acts or decisions of public authorities which have a bearing on such rights or obligations. The Term "final judicial review" means a judicial examination which is limited to the application of the law, such as a review by a Court of Cassation.

The right to liberty of movement and freedom to choose one's residence is applicable, subject to the federal laws on aliens, which provide that residence and establishment permits shall be valid only for the canton which issues them.

(c) Reservation concerning article 14, paragraph 5:

The reservation applies to the federal laws on the organization of criminal justice, which provide for an exception to the right of anyone convicted of a crime to have his conviction and sentence reviewed by a higher tribunal, where the person concerned is tried in the first instance by the highest tribunal.

[33] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 31 January 1979, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago confirmed that paragraph (vi) constituted an interpretative declaration which did not aim to exclude nor modify the legal effect of the provisions of the Covenant.

[34] In a communication received on 2 February 1993, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to sub-paragraph c) of article 25 made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1007, p. 394.

[35] The formality was effected by Democratic Yemen. See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[36] See "ENTRY INTO FORCE:" at the beginning of this chapter.

[37] A previous declaration received on 18 June 1992 expired on 18 June 1997.

[38] Previous declarations, received 22 April 1976, 28 March

1981, 24 March 1986, 10 May 1991 and 22 January 1997 expired on 28 March 1981, 28 March 1986, 28 March 1991, 10 May 1996 and 22 January 2002.

[39] A note verbal, dated 28 January 1998, transmitting the text of the declaration made by the Government of Spain recognizing the competence of the Human Rights Committee under article 41 of the Covenant was deposited on 30 January 1998. Subsequently, in order to correct an error contained in that decalration, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Spain a note verbal dated 9 March 1998, transmitting a corrected and signed text of the declaration which was deposited on 11 March 1998.

Previous declarations were received on 25 January 1985 and 21 December 1988, and expired on 25 January 1988 and 21 December 1993, respectively.

[40] On 3 October 1983, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following declaration in respect of the territorial application of the Covenant to the Falkland Islands:

[The Government of Argentina makes a] formal objection to the [declaration] of territorial extension issued by the United Kingdom with regard to the Malvinas Islands (and dependencies), which that country is illegally occupying and refers to as the "Falkland Islands".

The Argentine Republic rejects and considers null and void the [said declaration] of territorial extension.

With reference to the above-mentioned objection the Secretary-General received on 28 February 1985 from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the following declaration:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to their right, by notification to the Depositary under the relevant provisions of the above-mentioned Convention, to extend the application of the Convention in question to the Falkland Islands or to the Falkland Islands Dependencies, as the case may be.

For this reason alone, the Government of the United Kingdom are unable to regard the Argentine [communication] under reference as having any legal effect."

With reference to the above-mentioned declaration by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following declaration made upon ratification:

The Argentine Republic rejects the extension, notified to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 20 May 1976 by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, of the application of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights,adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 16 December 1966, to the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands, and reaffirms its sovereign rights to those archipelagos, whichrm anntegral part of its national territory.

The General Assembly of the United Nations had adopted resol- utions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6 and 40/21 in which it recognizes the existence of a sovereignty dispute regarding the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and urges the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to pursue negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful and definitive solution to the dispute, through the good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall inform the General Assembly of the progress made."

With reference to the above-mentioned declaration by the Govern- ment of Argentina, the Secretary-General received on 13 January 1988 from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following communication:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Irelan d rejects the statements made by the Argentine Republic, regarding the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, when ratifying [the said Covenants and acceding to the said Protocol].

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland has no doubt as to British sovereignty over the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and its consequent right to extend treaties to those territories."

Subsequently, on 5 October 2000, the Secretary-General recieved the from the Government of Argentina the following communication:

[The Argentine Republic] wishes to refer to the report submitted by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the Human Rights Committee concerning its overseas territories (CCPR/C/UKOT/99/5).

In that connection, the Argentine Republic wishes to recall that by its note of 3 October 1983 it rejected the extension of the application of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights to the Malvinas Islands, which waseffected bythe United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on 20 May 1976.

The Government of Argentina rejects the designation of the Malvinas Islands as Overseas Dependent Territories of the United Kingdom or any other similar designation.

Consequently, the Argentine Republic does not recognize the section concerning the Malvinas Islands contained in the report which the United Kingdom has submitted to the Human Rights Committee (CCPR/C/UKOT/99/5) or any other document or instrument having a similar tenor that may derive from this alleged territorial extension.

The United Nations General Assembly has adopted resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25, in which it recognizes that a dispute exists concerning sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands and urges the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to continue negotiations with a view to resolving the dispute peacefully and definitively as soon as possible, assisted by the good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who is to report to the General Assembly on the progress made.

The Argentine Republic reaffirms its rights of sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime spaces, which are an integral part of its national territory.

Further, on 20 December 2000, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the following communcation:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland rejects as unfounded the claims made by the Argentine Republic in its communication to the depositary of 5 [October] 2000. The Government of the United Kingdom recalls that in its declaration received by the depositary on 13 January 1988 it rejected the objection by the Argentine Republic to the extension by the United Kingdom of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights to the Falkland Islands and to South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands. The Government of the United Kingdom has no doubt about the sovereignty of the United Kingdom over the Falkland Islands and over South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and its consequential rights to apply the Convention with respect to those territories."

5. OPTIONAL PROTOCOL TO THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS

New York, 16 December 1966

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	23 March 1976, in accordance with article 9.
REGISTRATION:	23 March 1976, No. 14668.
STATUS:	Signatories: 35. Parties: 111.[1,2,3]
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 999, p. 171.

Note: The Protocol was opened for signature at New York on 19 December 1966.

Participant[4,5]	*Signature, Succession to signature(d)*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Albania		4 Oct 2007 a
Algeria		12 Sep 1989 a
Andorra	5 Aug 2002	22 Sep 2006
Angola		10 Jan 1992 a
Argentina		8 Aug 1986 a
Armenia		23 Jun 1993 a
Australia		25 Sep 1991 a
Austria	10 Dec 1973	10 Dec 1987
Azerbaijan		27 Nov 2001 a
Barbados		5 Jan 1973 a
Belarus		30 Sep 1992 a
Belgium		17 May 1994 a
Benin		12 Mar 1992 a
Bolivia		12 Aug 1982 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1 Mar 1995	1 Mar 1995
Bulgaria		26 Mar 1992 a
Burkina Faso		4 Jan 1999 a
Cambodia	27 Sep 2004	
Cameroon		27 Jun 1984 a
Canada		19 May 1976 a
Cape Verde		19 May 2000 a
Central African Republic		8 May 1981 a
Chad		9 Jun 1995 a
Chile		27 May 1992 a
Colombia	21 Dec 1966	29 Oct 1969
Congo		5 Oct 1983 a
Costa Rica	19 Dec 1966	29 Nov 1968
Côte d'Ivoire		5 Mar 1997 a
Croatia		12 Oct 1995 a
Cyprus	19 Dec 1966	15 Apr 1992
Czech Republic[6]		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic Republic of the Congo		1 Nov 1976 a
Denmark	20 Mar 1968	6 Jan 1972
Djibouti		5 Nov 2002 a
Dominican Republic		4 Jan 1978 a
Ecuador	4 Apr 1968	6 Mar 1969
El Salvador	21 Sep 1967	6 Jun 1995
Equatorial Guinea		25 Sep 1987 a
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Finland	11 Dec 1967	19 Aug 1975
France		17 Feb 1984 a
Gambia		9 Jun 1988 a
Georgia		3 May 1994 a
Germany		25 Aug 1993 a
Ghana	7 Sep 2000	7 Sep 2000
Greece		5 May 1997 a
Guatemala		28 Nov 2000 a
Guinea	19 Mar 1975	17 Jun 1993
Guinea-Bissau	12 Sep 2000	
Guyana[2]		5 Jan 1999 a
Honduras	19 Dec 1966	7 Jun 2005
Hungary		7 Sep 1988 a
Iceland		22 Aug 1979 a
Ireland		8 Dec 1989 a
Italy	30 Apr 1976	15 Sep 1978
Jamaica[3]	[19 Dec 1966]	[3 Oct 1975]
Kazakhstan	25 Sep 2007	
Kyrgyzstan		7 Oct 1994 a
Latvia		22 Jun 1994 a
Lesotho		6 Sep 2000 a
Liberia	22 Sep 2004	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 May 1989 a
Liechtenstein		10 Dec 1998 a
Lithuania		20 Nov 1991 a
Luxembourg		18 Aug 1983 a
Madagascar	17 Sep 1969	21 Jun 1971

Participant[4,5]	*Signature, Succession to signature(d)*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Malawi		11 Jun 1996 a
Maldives		19 Sep 2006 a
Mali		24 Oct 2001 a
Malta		13 Sep 1990 a
Mauritius		12 Dec 1973 a
Mexico		15 Mar 2002 a
Mongolia		16 Apr 1991 a
Montenegro[7]		23 Oct 2006 d
Namibia		28 Nov 1994 a
Nauru	12 Nov 2001	
Nepal		14 May 1991 a
Netherlands[8]	25 Jun 1969	11 Dec 1978
New Zealand[9]		26 May 1989 a
Nicaragua		12 Mar 1980 a
Niger		7 Mar 1986 a
Norway	20 Mar 1968	13 Sep 1972
Panama	27 Jul 1976	8 Mar 1977
Paraguay		10 Jan 1995 a
Peru	11 Aug 1977	3 Oct 1980
Philippines	19 Dec 1966	22 Aug 1989
Poland		7 Nov 1991 a
Portugal	1 Aug 1978	3 May 1983
Republic of Korea		10 Apr 1990 a
Republic of Moldova	16 Sep 2005	23 Jan 2008
Romania		20 Jul 1993 a
Russian Federation		1 Oct 1991 a
San Marino		18 Oct 1985 a
Sao Tome and Principe	6 Sep 2000	
Senegal	6 Jul 1970	13 Feb 1978
Serbia	12 Mar 2001 d	6 Sep 2001
Seychelles		5 May 1992 a
Sierra Leone		23 Aug 1996 a
Slovakia[6]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia		16 Jul 1993 a
Somalia		24 Jan 1990 a
South Africa		28 Aug 2002 a
Spain		25 Jan 1985 a
Sri Lanka		3 Oct 1997 a
St. Vincent and the Grenadines		9 Nov 1981 a
Suriname		28 Dec 1976 a
Sweden	29 Sep 1967	6 Dec 1971
Tajikistan		4 Jan 1999 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	12 Dec 1994 d	12 Dec 1994
Togo		30 Mar 1988 a
Trinidad and Tobago[1]		[14 Nov 1980 a]
Turkey	3 Feb 2004	24 Nov 2006
Turkmenistan		1 May 1997 a
Uganda		14 Nov 1995 a
Ukraine		25 Jul 1991 a
Uruguay	21 Feb 1967	1 Apr 1970
Uzbekistan		28 Sep 1995 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	15 Nov 1976	10 May 1978
Zambia		10 Apr 1984 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRIA

"On the understanding that, further to the provisions of article 5 (2) of the Protocol, the Committee provided for in Article 28 of the Covenant shall not consider any communication from an individual unless it has been ascertained that the same matter has not been examined by the European Commission on Human Rights established by the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms."

CHILE

Declaration:

In recognizing the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications from individuals, it is the understanding of the Government of Chile that this competence applies in respect of acts occurring after the entry into force for that State of the Optional Protocol or, in any event, to acts which began after 11 March 1990.

CROATIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Croatia interprets article 1 of this Protocol as giving the Committee the competence to receive and consider communications from individuals subject to the jurisdiction of the Republic of Croatia who claim to be victims of a violation by the Republic of any rights set forth in the Covenant which results either from acts, omissions or events occurring after the date on which the Protocol entered into force for the Republic of Croatia."

"With regard to article 5, paragraph 2 (a) of the Protocol, the Republic of Croatia specifies that the

Human Rights Committee shall not have competence to consider a communication from an individual if the same matter is being examined or has already been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement."

DENMARK

"With reference to article 5, paragraph 2 (a), the Government of Denmark makes a reservation with respect to the Competence of the Committee to consider a communication from an individual if the matter has already been considered under other procedures of international investigation."

EL SALVADOR

Reservation:

... That its provisions mean that the competence of the Human Rights Committee is recognized solely to receive and consider communications from individuals solely and exclusively in those situations, events, cases, omissions and legal occurrences or acts the execution of which began after the date of deposit of the instrument of ratification, that is, those which took place three months after the date of the deposit, pursuant to article 9, paragraph 2, of the Protocol; the Committee being also without competence to examine communications and/or complaints which have been submitted to other procedures of international investigation or settlement.

FRANCE

Declaration:

France interprets article 1 of the Protocol as giving the Committee the competence to receive and consider communications from individuals subject to the jurisdiction of the French Republic who claim to be victims of a violation by the Republic of any of the rights set forth in the Covenant which results either from acts, omissions, developments or events occurring after the date on which the Protocol entered into force for the Republic, or from a decision relating to acts, omissions, developments or events after that date. With regard to article 7, France's accession to the Optional Protocol should not be interpreted as implying any change in its position concerning the resolution referred to in that article.

Reservation:

France makes a reservation to article 5, paragraph 2(a), specifying that the Human Rights Committee shall not have competence to consider a communication from an individual if the same matter is being examined or has already been considered under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

GERMANY

Reservation:

"The Federal Republic of Germany formulates a reservation concerning article 5 paragraph 2 (a) to the effect that the competence of the Committee shall not apply to communications

a) which have already been considered under another procedure of international investigation or settlement, or

b) by means of which a violation of rights is reprimanded having its origin in events occurring prior to the entry into force of the Optional Protocol for the Federal Republic of Germany

c) by means of which a violation of article 26 of the [said Covenant] is reprimanded, if and insofar as the reprimanded violation refers to rights other than those guaranteed under the aforementioned Covenant."

GUATEMALA

Declaration:

The Republic of Guatemala recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications from individuals subject to the jurisdiction of the Republic who claim to be victims of a violation by Guatemala of any of the rights set forth in the International Covenant relating to acts, omissions, situations or events occurring after the date on which the Optional Protocol entered into force for the Republic of Guatemala or to decisions resulting from acts, omissions, situations or events after that date.

GUYANA[2]

Reservation:

"[...] Guyana re-accedes to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights with a Reservation to article 6 thereof with the result that the Human Rights Committee shall not be competent to receive and consider communications from any persons who is under sentence of death for the offences of murder and treason in respect of any matter relating to his prosecution, detention, trial, conviction, sentence or execution of the death sentence and any matter connected therewith.

Accepting the principle that States cannot generally use the Optional Protocol as a vehicle to enter reservations to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights itself, the Government of Guyana stresses that its Reservation to the Optional Protocol in no way detracts from its obligations and engagements under the Covenant, including its undertaking to respect and ensure to all individuals within the territory of Guyana and subject to its jurisdiction the rights recognised in the Covenant (in so far as not already reserved against) as set out in article 2 thereof, as well as its undertaking to report to the Human Rights Committee under the monitoring mechanism established by article 40 thereof."

ICELAND

Iceland ... accedes to the said Protocol subject to a reservation, with reference to article 5, paragraph 2, with respect to the competence of the Human Rights Committee to consider a communication from an individual if the matter is being examined or has been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement. Other provisions of the Covenant shall be inviolably observed.

IRELAND

Article 5, paragraph 2

Ireland does not accept the competence of the Human Rights Committee to consider a communication from an individual if the matter has already been considered under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

ITALY

The Italian Republic ratifies the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, it being understood that the provisions of article 5, paragraph 2, of the Protocol mean that the Committee provided for in article 28 of the Covenant shall not consider any communication from an individual unless it has ascertained that the same matter is not being and has not been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

LUXEMBOURG

Declaration:

"The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg accedes to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, on the understanding that the provisions of article 5, paragraph 2, of the Protocol mean that the Committee established by article 28 of the Covenant shall not consider any communications from an individual unless it has ascertained that the same matter is not being examined or has not already been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement."

MALTA

Declarations:

" 1. Malta accedes to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, on the understanding that the provisions of article 5, paragraph 2, of the Protocol mean that the Committee established by article 28 of the Covenant, shall not consider any communication from an individual unless it has ascertained that the same matter is not being examined or has not already been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

"2. The Government of Malta interprets Article 1 of the Protocol as giving the Committee the competence to receive and consider communications from individuals subject to the jurisdiction of Malta who claim to be victims of a violation by Malta of any of the rights set forth in the Covenant which results either from acts, omissions, developments or events occurring after the date on which the Protocol enters into force for Malta, or from a decision relating to acts, omissions, developments or events after that date."

NORWAY

Subject to the following reservation to article 5, paragraph 2: "... The Committee shall not have competence to consider a communication from an individual if the same matter has already been examined under other procedures of international investigation or settlement."

POLAND

Poland accedes to the Protocol while making a reservation that would exclude the procedure set out in article 5 (2) (a), in cases where the matter has already been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

Declarations:

Until the full re-establishment of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova, the provisions of the [Protocol] will be applied only on the territory controlled effectively by the authorities of the Republic of Moldova.

The Human Rights Committee shall not have competence to examine communications from individuals referring to violations of any of the rights set forth in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights committed until the date of the enter into force of the present Protocol for the Republic of Moldova.

Reservation:

According to the Article 5 paragraph (2) letter a) of the Protocol: the Human Rights Committee shall not have competence to consider communications from an individual if the matter is being or has already been examined by another international specialized body.

ROMANIA

Declaration:

Romania considers that, in accordance with article 5, paragraph 2(a) of the Protocol, the Human Rights Committee shall not have competence to consider communications from an individual if the matter is being or has already been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Declaration:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, pursuant to article 1 of the Optional Protocol, recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications from individuals subject to the jurisdiction of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in respect of situations or events occurring after the date on which the Protocol entered into force for the USSR. The Soviet Union also proceeds from the understanding that the Committee shall not consider any communications unless it has been ascertained that the same matter is not being examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement and that the individual in question has exhausted all available domestic remedies.

SLOVENIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Slovenia interprets article 1 of the Protocol as giving the Committee the competence to receive and consider communications from individuals subject to the jurisdiction of the Republic of Slovenia who claim to be victims of a violation by the Republic of any of the rights set forth in the Covenant which results either from acts or omissions, developments or events occurring after the date on which the Protocol entered into force for the Republic of Slovenia, or from a decision relating to acts, omissions, developments or events after that date."

Reservation:

"With regard to article 5, paragraph 2(a) of the Optional Protocol, the Republic of Slovenia specifies that the Human Rights Committee shall not have competence to consider a communication from an individual if the same matter is being examined or has already been considered under another procedure of international investigation or settlement."

SPAIN

The Spanish Government accedes to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, on the understanding that the provisions of article 5, paragraph 2, of that Protocol mean that the Human Rights Committee shall not consider any communication from an individual unless it has ascertained that the same matter has not been or is not being examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

SRI LANKA

Declaration:

"The Government of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka pursuant to article (1) of the Optional Protocol recognises the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications from individuals subject to the jurisdiction of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, who claim to be victims of a violation of any of the rights set forth in the Covenant which results either from acts, omissions, developments or events occurring after the date on which the Protocol entered into force for the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka or from a decision relating to acts, omissions, developments or events after that date. The Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka also proceeds on the understanding that the Committee shall not consider any communication from individuals unless it has ascertained that the same matter is not being examined or has not been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement."

SWEDEN

On the understanding that the provisions of article 5, paragraph 2, of the Protocol signify that the Human Rights Committee provided for in article 28 of the said Covenant shall not consider any communication from an individual unless it has ascertained that the same matter is not being examined or has not been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO[1]

Reservation:

"[...] Trinidad and Tobago re-accedes to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights with a Reservation to article 1 thereof to the effect that the Human Rights Committee shall not be competent to receive and consider communications relating to any prisoner who is under sentence of death in respect of any matter relating to his prosecution, his detention, his trial, his conviction, his sentence or the carrying out of the death sentence on him and any matter connected therewith.

Accepting the principle that States cannot use the Optional Protocol as a vehicle to enter reservations to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights itself, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago stresses that its Reservation to the Optional Protocol in no way detracts from its obligations and engagements under the Covenant, including its undertaking to respect and ensure to all individuals within the territory of Trinidad and Tobago and subject to its jurisdiction the rights recognised in the Covenant (in so far as not already reserved against) as set out in article 2 thereof, as well as its undertaking to report to the Human Rights Committee under the monitoring mechanism established by article 40 thereof."

TURKEY

Statements

"The Republic of Turkey declares that the three declarations and the reservation made by the Republic to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights shall also apply to the present Optional Protocol. "

"The Republic of Turkey interprets article 1 of the Protocol as giving the Committee the competence to receive and consider communications from individuals subject to the jurisdiction of the Republic of Turkey who claim to be the victims of a violation by the Republic of any of the rights set forth in the Covenant."

Reservations :

"The Republic of Turkey formulates a reservation concerning article 5 paragraph 2 (a) of the Protocol to the effect that the competence of the Committee:

a) shall not apply to communications from individuals if the same matter has already been considered or is being considered under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

b) shall be limited to communications concerning alleged violations which result either from acts, omissions, developments or events that may occur within the national boundaries of the territory of the Republic of Turkey after the date on which the protocol enters into force for the Republic of Turkey, or from a decision relating to acts, omissions, developments or events that may occur within the national boundaries of the territory of the Republic of Turkey after the date on which the Protocol enters into force for the Republic of Turkey.

c) shall not apply to communications by means of which a violation of article 26 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is reprimanded, if and insofar as the reprimanded violation refers to rights other than those guaranteed under the aforementioned Covenant."

Statements :

"The Republic of Turkey declares that the three declarations and the reservation made by the Republic to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights shall also apply to the present Optional Protocol."

"The Republic of Turkey interprets article 1 of the Protocol as giving the Committee the competence to receive and consider communications from individuals subject to the jurisdiction of the Republic of Turkey who claim to be the victims of a violation by the Republic of any of the rights set forth in the Covenant."

The three declarations and the reservation made by the Republic of Turkey to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights read as follows:

The Republic of Turkey declares that; it will implement its obligations under the Covenant in accordance to the obligations under the Charter of the United Nations (especially Article 1 and 2 thereof).

The Republic of Turkey declares that it will implement the provisions of this Covenant only to the States with which it has diplomatic relations. The Republic of Turkey declares that this Convention is ratified exclusively with regard to the national territory where the Constitution and the legal and administrative order of the Republic of Turkey are applied.

The Republic of Turkey reserves the right to interpret and apply the provisions of Article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights in accordance with the related provisions and rules of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey and the Treaty of Lausanne of 24 July 1923 and its Appendixes.

UGANDA

Reservation:

Article 5

"The Republic of Uganda does not accept the competence of the Human Rights Committee to consider a communication under the provisions of article 5 paragraph 2 from an individual if the matter in question has already been considered under another procedure of international investigation or settlement."

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

[Same reservation as the one made by Venezuela in respect of article 14(3)(d) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: see chapter IV.4.]

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

DENMARK

6 August 1999

With regard to the reservation made by Trinidad and Tobago upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of Denmark finds that the reservation made by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago at the time of its re-accession to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights raises doubts as to the commitment of Trinidad and Tobago to the object and purpose of the Optional Protocol.

The reservation seeks to limit the obligations of the reserving State towards individuals under sentence of death. The purpose of the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is to strengthen the position of the individual under the Covenant. Denying the benefits of the Optional Protocol to a group of individuals under the most severe sentence is not in conformity with the object and purpose of the Optional Protocol.

The procedure followed by Trinidad and Tobago, of denouncing the Optional Protocol followed by a re-accession with a reservation circumvents the rules of the law of treaties that prohibit the formulation of reservations after ratification. The Government of the Kingdom of Denmark therefore objects to the aforementioned reservation made by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Optional Protocol between the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark and the Government of Trinidad and Tobago.".

FRANCE

28 January 2000

With regard to the reservation made by Guyana upon accession:

... While article 12, paragraph 1, of the Protocol provides that any State Party may denounce the Protocol 'at any time', with the denunciation taking effect 'three months after the date of receipt of the notification by the Secretary-General', denunciation of the Protocol may not in any case be used by a State Party for the purpose of formulating reservations to the Covenant well after the party has signed, ratified or acceded thereto. Such a practice would call into question international commitments by a sort of abuse of process; it would be a clear violation of the principle of good faith that prevails in international law and would be incompatible with the rule of *pacta sunt servanda.* The means used (denunciation and accession on the same day to the same instrument but with a reservation) cannot but elicit a negative reaction.

Consequently, the Government of the French Republic expresses its objection to the reservation made by Guyana.

GERMANY

26 August 1999

With regard to the reservation made by Guyana upon accession:

"The purpose of the Protocol is to strengthen the position of the individual under the Covenant. While the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany welcomes the decision of the Government of Guyana to reaccede to the Optional Protocol it holds the view that the benefits of the Optional Protocol should not be denied to individuals who are under the most severe sentence, the sentence of death. Furthermore, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the view that denunciation of an international human rights instrument followed by immediate reaccession under a far reaching reservation may set a bad precedent.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany objects to the reservation. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Optional Protocol between the Federal Republic of Germany and Guyana".

NETHERLANDS

22 October 1999

With regard to the reservation made by Guyana upon accession:

" ...

2. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the view that this reservation, which seeks to limit the obligations of the reserving State towards individuals under sentence of death, raises doubts as to the object and purpose of the Optional Protocol.

3. The Government of the Netherlands considers that the purpose of the Optional Protocol [to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights] is to strengthen the position of the individual under the Covenant. Denying the benefits of the Optional Protocol in relation to the Covenant to a group of individuals under the most severe sentence is fundamentally in conflict with the object and purpose of the Optional Protocol.

4. Also the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers the procedure followed by Guyana, of denouncing the Optional Protocol followed by a re-accession with reservations, as contrary to the rules of the law of treaties that prohibit the formulation of reservations after ratification. The procedure followed by Guyana circumvents such well-established rules.

5. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforementioned reservation made by the Government of Guyana to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

6. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Optional Protocol between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Guyana".

NORWAY

6 August 1999

With regard to the reservation made by Trinidad and Tobago upon accession:

"The Government of Norway considers that the object and purpose of the Optional Protocol is to contribute to securing the compliance with the provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights by strengthening the position of the individual under the Covenant. Due to the universality of all Human Rights, the right to petition, which is enshrined in article 1 of the Optional Protocol, must apply to all individuals that are subject to the State Party's jurisdiction. Further, denying the benefits of the Optional Protocol in relation to the

Covenant to a vulnerable group of individuals will contribute to further weakening of that group's position which the Government of Norway considers to be contrary to the object and purpose of the Optional Protocol.

Further, the Government of Norway is concerned with regard to the procedure followed by Trinidad and Tobago. The Government of Norway considers the denunciation of the Optional Protocol followed by a re-accession upon which a reservation is entered, as a circumvention of established rules of the law of treaties that prohibit the submission of reservations after ratification.

For these reasons, the Government of Norway objects to the reservation made by Trinidad and Tobago.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Optional Protocol between the Kingdom of Norway and Trinidad and Tobago."

SPAIN

1 Decmeber 1999

With regard to the reservation made by Guyana upon accession:

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that this reservation raises doubts about the commitment of the Republic of Guyana to the purpose and goal of the Optional Protocol, which is to strengthen the position of the individual with regard to the rights protected by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The reservation, on the other hand, seeks to limit the international obligations of Guyana towards individuals who are under sentence of death.

The Government of Spain also has doubts about the correctness of the procedure followed by the Government of Guyana, inasmuch as denunciation of the Optional Protocol followed by re-accession to it with a reservation prejudices the ratification process and undermines the international protection of human rights.

Consequently, the Government of Spain objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Guyana to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection does not prevent the entry into force of the Optional Protocol between the Kingdom of Spain and the Republic of Guyana.

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Netherlands[8]	11 Dec 1978	Netherlands Antilles

Notes:

[1] The Government of Trinidad and Tobago acceded to the Optional Protocol on 14 November 1980. On 26 May 1998 the Government of Trinidad and Tobago informed the Secretary-General of its decision to denounce the Optional Protocol with effect from 26 August 1998. On 26 August 1998, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago re-acceded to the Optional Protocol with a reservation. On 27 March 2000, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to denounce the Optional Protocol for the second time with effect from 27 June 2000.

The Secretary-General received communications from the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Netherlands (6 August 1999):

"1. [...]

2. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the view that this reservation, which seeks to limit the obligations of the reserving State towards individuals under sentence of death, raises doubts as to the commitment of Trinidad and Tobago to the object and purpose of the Optional Protocol.

3. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the purpose of the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is to strengthen the position of the individual under the Covenant. Denying the benefits of the Optional Protocol in relation to the Covenant to a group of individuals under the most severe sentence is fundamentally in conflict with the object and purpose of the Optional Protocol.

4. Also the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers the procedure followed by Trinidad and Tobago, of denouncing the Optional Protocol followed by a re-accession with reservations, as contrary to the rules of the law of treaties that prohibit the formulation of reservations after ratification. The procedure followed by Trinidad and Tobago circumvents such well-established rules.

5. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforementioned reservation made by the Governme of Trinidad and Tobago to the Protocol of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

6. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Optional Protocol between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Trinidad and Tobago."

Germany (13 August 1999):

"The purpose of the Protocol is to strengthen the position of the individual under the Covenant. While the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany welcomes the decision of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago to reaccede to the Optional Protocol it holds the view that the benefits of the Optional Protocol should not be denied to individuals who are under the most severe sentence, the sentence of death. Furthermore, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the view that denunciation of an international human rights instrument followed by immediate reaccession under a far reaching reservation may set a bad precedent.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany objects to the reservation. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Optional Protocol between the Federal Republic of Germany and Trinidad and Tobago."

Sweden (17 August 1999):

"The Government of Sweden notes that the Government of Trinidad and Tobago accepts the principle that States cannot use the Optional Protocol as a vehicle to enter reservations to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights itself, and it stresses that its reservation in no way detracts from its obligations and engagements under the Covenant.

Nevertheless the Government of Sweden has serious doubts as to the propriety of the procedure followed by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago in that denunciation of the Optional Protocol succeeded by re-accession with a reservation undermines the basis of international treaty law as well as the international protection of human rights. The Government of Sweden therefore wishes to declare its grave concern over this method of proceeding.

Furthermore the reservation seeks to limit the international obligations of Trinidad and Tobago towards individuals under sentence to death. The Government of Sweden is of the view that the right to life is fundamental and that the death penalty cannot be accepted.

It is therefore of utmost importance that states that persist in this practice refrain from further weakening the position of that group of individuals."

Ireland (23 August 1999) :

"1. [..]

2.The Government of Ireland is of the view that this reservation raises doubts as to the commitment of Trinidad and Tobago to the object and purpose of the Optional Protocol, which is to strengthen the position of the individual in respect of the rights protected by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The reservation on the contrary seeks to limit the international obligations of Trinidad and Tobago towards individuals under sentence of death.

3.The Government of Ireland also has doubts as to the propriety of the procedure followed by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago in that denunciation of the Optional Protocol, succeeded by re-accession with a reservation, compromises the ratification process and undermines the International protection of human rights.

4.The Government of Ireland therefore objects to the aforementioned reservation made by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

5.The objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Optional Protocol between Ireland and Trinidad and Tobago."

Spain (25 August 1999):

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain believes that this reservation casts doubt on the commitment of Trinidad and Tobago to the object and purpose of the Optional Protocol, which is clearly to strengthen the individual's position with respect to the rights enshrined in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. On the contrary, the aim of the reservation is tolimit the international obligations of Trinidad and Tobago towards individuals under sentence of death.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain also has reservations about whether the Government of Trinidad and Tobago has followed the proper procedure; the denunciation of the Optional Protocol, followed by re-accession to it with a reservation, prejudices the ratification process and undermines the international protection of human rights.

Accordingly, the Government of Spain objects to this reservation made by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Optional Protocol as between the Kingdom of Spain and Trinidad and Tobago.

France (9 September 1999):

[...]While article 12, paragraph 1, of the Protocol provides that any State Party may denounce the Protocol "at any time" and that the denunciation shall take effect "three months after the date of receipt of the notification by the Secretary-General", the denunciation of the Protocol may in no case be used by a State Party for the sole purpose of formulating reservations to that instrument after having signed, ratified or acceded to it. Such a practice would undermine international commitments by constituting a form of misuse of procedure, would be manifestly contrary to the principle of good faith prevailing in international law and would contravene the rule of pacta sunt servanda. The means used (denunciation and accession on the same day to the same instrument, but with a reservation) cannot but prompt a negative reaction, irrespective of the doubts which may arise as to the compatibility of this reservation with the goal and purpose of the treaty.

Consequently, the Government of the French Republic expresses its disapproval of the reservation formulated by Trinidad and Tobago.

Italy (17 September 1999):

"The Government of the Italian Republic finds that the reservation made by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago at the time of its re-accession to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights raises doubts as to the commitment of Trinidad and Tobago to the object and purpose of the Optional Protocol which is to strengthen the position of the individual in respect of the rights under the Covenant.

The reservation on the contrary seeks to limit the international obligations of Trinidad and Tobago towards individuals under sentence of death. The Government of the Italian Republic also has doubts as to the propriety of the procedure followed by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago in that denunciation of the Optional Protocol, succeded by a re-accession with a reservation compromises the ratification process and undermines the international protection of human rights. The Government of the Italian Republic therefore objects to the afore-mentioned reservation made by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Optional Protocol between Italy and Trinidad and Tobago." The Government of Trinidad and Tobago initially acceded to the Optional Protocol on 14 November 1980. On 26 May 1998, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago informed the Secretary-General of its decision to denounce the Optional Protocol with effect from 26 August 1998. On that same date, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago re-acceded to the Optional Protocol. The new accession took effect on 26 August 1998.

The reservation on the contrary seeks to limit the international obligations of Trinidad and Tobago towards individuals under sentence of death. The Government of the Italian Republic also has doubts as to the propriety of the procedure followed by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago in that denunciation of the Optional Protocol, succeded by a re-accession with a reservaion compromises the ratification process and undermines the international protection of human rights.

The Government of the Italian Republic therefore objects to the afore-mentioned reservation made by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Optional Protocol between Italy and Trinidad and Tobago." The Government of Trinidad and Tobago initially acceded to the Optional Protocol on 14 November 1980. On 26 May 1998, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago informed the Secretary-General of its decision to denounce the Optional Protocol with effect from 26 August 1998. On that same date, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago re-acceded to the Optional Protocol. The new accession took effect on 26 August 1998.

[2] The Government of Guyana had initially acceded to the Optional Protocol on 10 May 1993. On 5 January 1999, the Government of Guyana notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to denounce the said Optional Protocol with effect from 5 April 1999. On that same date, the Government of Guyana re-acceded to the Optional Protocol with a reservation.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received the following communications from the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Finland (17 March 2000):

"The Government of Finland is of the view that denying the rights recognised in the Optional Protocol from individuals under the most severe sentence is in contradiction with the object and purpose of the said Protocol.

Furthermore, the Government of Finland wishes to express its serious concern as to the procedure followed by Guyana, of denouncing the Optional Protocol (to which it did not have any reservations) followed by an immediate re-accession with a reservation. The Government of Finland is of the view that such a procedure is highly undesirable as circumventing the rule of the law of treaties that prohibits the formulation of reservations after accession.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of Guyana to the said Protocol.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Optional Protocol between Guyana and Finland. The Optional Protocol will thus become operative between the two states without Guyana benefitting from the reservation".

Sweden (27 April 2000):

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservation to article 1 made by the Government of Guyana at the time of its re-accession to the Optional Protocol. The Government of Sweden notes that the Government of Guyana accepts the principle that States cannot use the Optional Protocol as a vehicle to enter reservations to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights itself, and that it stresses that iteservation in no way detracts from its obligations and engagements under the Covenant.

Nevertheless, the Government of Sweden has serious doubts as to the propriety of the procedure followed by the Government of Guyana. While article 12, paragraph 1 of the Protocol provides that any State Party may denounce the Protocol "at any time", the denunciation may in no case be used by a State Party for the sole purpose of formulating reservations to that instrument after having re-acceeded to it. Such a practice would constitute a misuse of the procedure and would be manifestly contrary to the principle of good faith. It further contravenes the rule of pacta sunt servanda. As such, it undermines the basis of international treaty law and the protection of human rights. The Government of Sweden therefore wishes to declare its grave concern over this method of proceeding.

Furthermore, the reservation seeks to limit the international obligations of Guyana towards individuals under sentence of death. The Government of Sweden is of the view that the right to life is fundamental and that the death penalty cannot be accepted. It is therefore of utmost importance that states that persist in this practice refrain from further weakening the position of that group of individuals."

Poland (8 August 2000):

The Government of the Republic of Poland believes that this reservation seeks to deny the benefits of the Optional Protocol towards a group of individuals under the sentence of death. This reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the Protocol which is to strengthen the position of individuals in respect of the human rights protected by the Covenant. Furthermore the Government of the Republic of Poland considers the procedure followed by the Government of the Republic of Guyana in the denunciation of the Optional Protocol, and its subsequent re-accession with reservation as not consistent with the law of treaties and clearly undermining the Protocol. The Government of the Republic of Poland therefore objects to the above mentioned reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Guyana. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Optional Protocol between the Republic of Poland and the Republic of Guyana.

[3] On 23 October 1997, the Government of Jamaica notified the Secretary-General of its denunciation of the Protocol.

[4] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 5 October

1967. See also note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

With reference to the above-mentioned signature, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Representatives of Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia, stating that their Governments did not recognize the said signature as valid since the only Government authorized to represent China and to assume obligations on its behalf was the Government of the People's Republic of China.

In letters addressed to the Secretary-General in regard to the above-mentioned communications, the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations stated that the Republic of China, a sovereign State and Member of the United Nations, had attended the twenty-first regular session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and contributed to the formulation of, and signed the Covenants and the Optional Protocol concerned, and that "any statements or reservations relating to the above-mentioned Covenants and Optional Protocol that are incompatible with or derogatory to the legitimate position of the Government of the Republic of China shall in no way affect the rights and obligations of the Republic of China under these Covenants and Optional Protocol".

[5] The former Yugoslavia had signed the Optional Protocol on 14 March 1990. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] Czechoslovakia acceded to the Optional Protocol on 12 March 1991. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] See note 1 under "New Zealand"" regarding Tokelau in the""Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

6. CONVENTION ON THE NON-APPLICABILITY OF STATUTORY LIMITATIONS TO WAR CRIMES AND CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY

New York, 26 November 1968[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	11 November 1970, in accordance with article VIII.
REGISTRATION:	11 November 1970, No. 10823.
STATUS:	Signatories: 9. Parties: 52.
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 754, p. 73.

Note: The Convention was opened for signature at New York from 16 December 1968 until 31 December 1969, in accordance with its article V.

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Afghanistan		22 Jul 1983 a
Albania		19 May 1971 a
Argentina		26 Aug 2003 a
Armenia		23 Jun 1993 a
Azerbaijan		16 Aug 1996 a
Belarus	7 Jan 1969	8 May 1969
Bolivia		6 Oct 1983 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[3]		1 Sep 1993 d
Bulgaria	21 Jan 1969	21 May 1969
Cameroon		6 Oct 1972 a
Croatia[3]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba		13 Sep 1972 a
Czech Republic[4]		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		8 Nov 1984 a
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Gambia		29 Dec 1978 a
Georgia		31 Mar 1995 a
Ghana		7 Sep 2000 a
Guinea		7 Jun 1971 a
Hungary	25 Mar 1969	24 Jun 1969
India		12 Jan 1971 a
Kenya		1 May 1972 a
Kuwait		7 Mar 1995 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		28 Dec 1984 a
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 a
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 May 1989 a
Lithuania		1 Feb 1996 a
Mexico	3 Jul 1969	15 Mar 2002
Moldova		26 Jan 1993 a
Mongolia	31 Jan 1969	21 May 1969
Montenegro[5]		23 Oct 2006 d
Nicaragua		3 Sep 1986 a
Nigeria		1 Dec 1970 a
Panama		21 Jun 2007 a
Paraguay		23 Sep 2008 a
Peru		11 Aug 2003 a
Philippines		15 May 1973 a
Poland	16 Dec 1968	14 Feb 1969
Romania	17 Apr 1969	15 Sep 1969
Russian Federation	6 Jan 1969	22 Apr 1969
Rwanda		16 Apr 1975 a
Serbia[3]		12 Mar 2001 d
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[3]		6 Jul 1992 d
St. Vincent and the Grenadines		9 Nov 1981 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[3]		18 Jan 1994 d
Tunisia		15 Jun 1972 a
Ukraine	14 Jan 1969	19 Jun 1969
Uruguay		21 Sep 2001 a
Viet Nam		6 May 1983 a
Yemen[6]		9 Feb 1987 a

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AFGHANISTAN

Since the provisions of articles V and VII of the said Convention, according to which some States cannot become a party to the Convention, are not in conformity with the universal character of the Convention, the Presidium of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan states that, on the basis of the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the Convention should remain open to all States.

ALBANIA

The Government of the People's Republic of Albania states that the provisions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity are unacceptable because, in preventing a number of States from becoming parties to the Convention, they are discriminatory in nature and thus violate the principle of the sovereign equality of States and are incompatible with the spirit and purposes of the Convention.

BELARUS

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that the provisions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, which prevent certain States from signing the Convention or acceding to it are contrary to the principle of the sovereign equality of States.

BULGARIA

The People's Republic of Bulgaria deems it necessary at the same time to declare that the provisions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, which prevent a number of States from signing the Convention or acceding to it, are contrary to the principle of the sovereign equality of States.

CUBA

The Government of the Republic of Cuba declares that it regards the provisions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity as discriminatory and contrary to the principle of the equality of States.

CZECH REPUBLIC[4]

GUINEA

The Government of the Republic of Guinea considers that the dispositions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, adopted by the General Assembly on 26 November 1968, make it impossible for a number of States to become parties to the Convention and are therefore of a discriminatory character which is contradictory to the object and aims of this Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Guinea is of the opinion that, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, the Convention should be open to all States without any discrimination and limitation.

HUNGARY

"The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic declares that the provisions contained in articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 26, 1968, which deny the possibility to certain States to become signatories to the Convention are of discriminatory nature, violate the principles of sovereign equality of States and are more particularly incompatible with the objectives and purposes of the said Convention."

LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

The Lao People's Democratic Republic accedes to the above-mentioned Convention and undertakes to implement faithfully all its clauses, except for the provisions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 26 November 1968, which contravene the principle of the sovereign equality of States. The Convention should be open to universal participation in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

MEXICO

Interpretative declaration :

In accordance with article 14 of the Constitution of the United Mexican States, the Government of Mexico, when ratifying the Convention on the non-applicability of statutory limitations to war crimes and crimes against humanity, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 26 November 1968, will do so on the understanding that it will consider statutory limitations non-applicable only to crimes dealt with in the Convention which are committed after the entry into effect of the Convention with respect to Mexico.

MONGOLIA

"The Mongolian People's Republic deems it necessary to state that the provisions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity have discriminatory nature and seek to preclude certain States from participation in the Convention and declares that as the Convention deals with matters affecting the interests of all States it should be open to participation by all States without any discrimination or restriction."

PERU

Declaration:

In conformity with article 103 of its Political Constitution, the Peruvian State accedes to the 'Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity', adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 26 November 1968, with respect to crimes covered by the Convention that are committed after its entry into force for Peru.

POLAND

"The Polish People's Republic considers that the dispositions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, adopted by the General Assembly on the 26th of November 1968, make it impossible for a number of States to become parties to the Convention and are therefore of a discriminatory character which is contradictory to the object and aims of this Convention.

The Polish People's Republic is of the opinion that, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, the Convention should be open to all States without any discrimination and limitation."

ROMANIA

The State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania states that the provisions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity are not compatible with the principle that multilateral international treaties, the subject and purpose of which concern the international community as a whole, should be open for universal participation.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that the provisions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, which prevent certain States from signing the Convention or acceding to it, are contrary to the principle of the sovereign equality of States.

SLOVAKIA[4]

UKRAINE

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that the provisions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, which prevent certain States from signing the Convention or acceding to it, are contrary to the principle of the sovereign equality of States.

VIET NAM

The Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam deems it necessary to state in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States that the Convention should be open to all States without any discrimination and limitation.

Notes:

[1] Resolution 2391 (XXIII), *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Supplement No. 18* (A/7218), p. 40.

[2] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 27 March 1973 with reservations. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 862, p. 410. See also note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 16 December 1968 and 9 June 1970, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 21 May 1969 and 13 August 1970, respectively, with a declaration. For the text of the declaration made upon signature, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 754, p. 124. See also note 1 under “Czech Republic” and note 1 under “Slovakia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The formality was effected by Democratic Yemen. See also note 1 under “Yemen” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

7. INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE SUPPRESSION AND PUNISHMENT OF THE CRIME OF APARTHEID

New York, 30 November 1973

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 18 July 1976, in accordance with article XV(1).
REGISTRATION: 18 July 1976, No. 14861.
STATUS: Signatories: 31. Parties: 107.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1015, p. 243.

Note: The Convention was opened for signature at New York on 30 November 1973.

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Afghanistan		6 Jul 1983 a
Algeria	23 Jan 1974	26 May 1982
Antigua and Barbuda		7 Oct 1982 a
Argentina	6 Jun 1975	7 Nov 1985
Armenia		23 Jun 1993 a
Azerbaijan		16 Aug 1996 a
Bahamas		31 Mar 1981 a
Bahrain		27 Mar 1990 a
Bangladesh		5 Feb 1985 a
Barbados		7 Feb 1979 a
Belarus	4 Mar 1974	2 Dec 1975
Benin	7 Oct 1974	30 Dec 1974
Bolivia		6 Oct 1983 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]		1 Sep 1993 d
Bulgaria	27 Jun 1974	18 Jul 1974
Burkina Faso	3 Feb 1976	24 Oct 1978
Burundi		12 Jul 1978 a
Cambodia[3]		28 Jul 1981 a
Cameroon		1 Nov 1976 a
Cape Verde		12 Jun 1979 a
Central African Republic		8 May 1981 a
Chad	23 Oct 1974	23 Oct 1974
China		18 Apr 1983 a
Colombia		23 May 1988 a
Congo		5 Oct 1983 a
Costa Rica		15 Oct 1986 a
Croatia[2]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba		1 Feb 1977 a
Czech Republic[4]		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic Republic of the Congo		11 Jul 1978 a
Ecuador	12 Mar 1975	12 May 1975
Egypt		13 Jun 1977 a
El Salvador		30 Nov 1979 a
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Ethiopia		19 Sep 1978 a
Gabon		29 Feb 1980 a
Gambia		29 Dec 1978 a
Georgia		21 Mar 2005 a
Ghana		1 Aug 1978 a
Guatemala		15 Jun 2005 a
Guinea	1 Mar 1974	3 Mar 1975
Guyana		30 Sep 1977 a
Haiti		19 Dec 1977 a
Honduras		29 Apr 2005 a
Hungary	26 Apr 1974	20 Jun 1974
India		22 Sep 1977 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		17 Apr 1985 a
Iraq	1 Jul 1975	9 Jul 1975
Jamaica	30 Mar 1976	18 Feb 1977
Jordan	5 Jun 1974	1 Jul 1992
Kenya	2 Oct 1974	
Kuwait		23 Feb 1977 a
Kyrgyzstan		5 Sep 1997 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		5 Oct 1981 a
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 a
Lesotho		4 Nov 1983 a
Liberia		5 Nov 1976 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		8 Jul 1976 a
Madagascar		26 May 1977 a
Maldives		24 Apr 1984 a
Mali		19 Aug 1977 a
Mauritania		13 Dec 1988 a
Mexico		4 Mar 1980 a

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Moldova		28 Oct 2005 a
Mongolia	17 May 1974	8 Aug 1975
Montenegro[5]		23 Oct 2006 d
Mozambique		18 Apr 1983 a
Namibia[6]		11 Nov 1982 a
Nepal		12 Jul 1977 a
Nicaragua		28 Mar 1980 a
Niger		28 Jun 1978 a
Nigeria	26 Jun 1974	31 Mar 1977
Oman	3 Apr 1974	22 Aug 1991
Pakistan		27 Feb 1986 a
Panama	7 May 1976	16 Mar 1977
Paraguay		2 Dec 2005 a
Peru		1 Nov 1978 a
Philippines	2 May 1974	26 Jan 1978
Poland	7 Jun 1974	15 Mar 1976
Qatar	18 Mar 1975	19 Mar 1975
Romania	6 Sep 1974	15 Aug 1978
Russian Federation	12 Feb 1974	26 Nov 1975
Rwanda	15 Oct 1974	23 Jan 1981
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		9 Nov 1981 a
Sao Tome and Principe		5 Oct 1979 a
Senegal		18 Feb 1977 a
Serbia[2]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		13 Feb 1978 a
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[2]		6 Jul 1992 d
Somalia	2 Aug 1974	28 Jan 1975
Sri Lanka		18 Feb 1982 a
Sudan	10 Oct 1974	21 Mar 1977
Suriname		3 Jun 1980 a
Syrian Arab Republic	17 Jan 1974	18 Jun 1976
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[2]		18 Jan 1994 d
Togo		24 May 1984 a
Trinidad and Tobago	7 Apr 1975	26 Oct 1979
Tunisia		21 Jan 1977 a
Uganda	11 Mar 1975	10 Jun 1986
Ukraine	20 Feb 1974	10 Nov 1975
United Arab Emirates	9 Sep 1975	15 Oct 1975
United Republic of Tanzania		11 Jun 1976 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		28 Jan 1983 a
Viet Nam		9 Jun 1981 a
Yemen[7]		17 Aug 1987 a
Zambia		14 Feb 1983 a
Zimbabwe		13 May 1991 a

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ARGENTINA

Declaration:

It is the understanding of the Argentine Republic that article XII of the Convention should be interpreted to mean that its express consent shall be required in order for any dispute to which it is a party and which has not been settled by negotiation to be brought before the International Court of Justice.

BAHRAIN

Reservation:

"The accession by the State of Bahrain to the said Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith."

EGYPT[8]

INDIA

"The Government of the Republic of India accede to the said Convention with effect from 17 August 1977."

IRAQ

Ratification by the Republic of Iraq of the above Convention shall in no way imply recognition of Israel, or be conducive to the establishment of such relations therewith as may be provided for in the Convention.

KUWAIT[9]

"It is understood that the Accession of the State of Kuwait [. . .] does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the State of Kuwait."

MOLDOVA

Reservation:

Until the full establishment of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova, the provisions of the Convention will be applied only on the territory effectively controlled by the authorities of the Republic of Moldova.

MOZAMBIQUE

The People's Republic of Mozambique interprets article 12 of the Convention as to mean that the submission of any dispute concerning the interpretation and application of the Convention to the International Court of Justice shall be at the previous consent and request of all the parties to the dispute.

NEPAL

"The Constitution of Nepal contains provisions for the protection of individual rights, including the right to freedom of speech and expression, the right to form unions and associations not motivated by party politics and the right to freedom of professing his/her own religion; and nothing in the Convention shall be deemed to require or to authorize legislation or other action by Nepal incompatible with the provisions of the Constitution of Nepal.

"His Majesty's Government interprets article 4 of the said Convention as requiring a Party to the Convention to adopt further legislative measures in the fields covered by sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) of that article only insofar as His Majesty's Government may consider, with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that some legislative addition to, or variation of, existing law and practice in those fields is necessary for the attainment of the end specified in the earlier part of article 4.

"His Majesty's Government does not consider itself bound by the provision of article 12 of the Convention under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision."

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

"The ratification of the United Arab Emirates to this Convention shall in no way amount to recognition of nor the establishment of any treaty relations with Israel."

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

With a reservation excluding the provisions of article XII of the Convention.

YEMEN[7,9]

The accession of the Government of the Yemen Arab Republic to this Convention shall in no way imply recognition of Israel or the establishment of such relations therewith as may be provided for in the Convention.

Notes:

[1] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 2 May 1974 and 12 August 1974, respectively. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 17 December 1974 and 1 July 1975, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The Secretary-General received, on 10 September 1981 from the Government of Viet Nam, the following objection with regard to the accession of Democratic Kampuchea:

"The accession to the above-mentioned international Convention on behalf of the so-called `Government of Kampuchea' by the genocidal clique of Pol Pot-Ieng Sary-Khieu Samphan, which was overthrown on 7 January 1979 by the Kampuchean people, is completely illegal and has no legal value. Only the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, which is actually in power in Kampuchea, is empowered to represent the Kampuchea people and to sign and accede to international agreements and conventions.

As a party to that Convention, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam is of the opinion that the accession of the so-called `Government of Democratic Kampuchea' constitutes not only a gross violation of the standards of law and international morality, but also one of the most cynical affronts to the three million Kampucheans who are the victims of the most despicable crime of contemporary history, committed by the Pol Pot régime which is spurned by the whole of mankind."

Thereafter, similar communications objecting to the signature by Democratic Kampuchea were received by the Secretary-General on 14 September 1981 from the Government of the German Democratic Republic, on 12 November 1981 from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on 19 November 1981 from the Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, on 3 December 1981 from the Government of Hungary, on 5 January 1982 from the Government of Bulgaria, on 13 January 1982 from the Government of Mongolia, and on 17 May 1982 from the Government of Czechoslovakia.

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 29 August 1975 and 25 March 1976, respectively. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Namibia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] Democratic Yemen had signed the Convention on 31 July 1974. See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] Upon accession, the Government of Egypt had formulated a declaration concerning Israel. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1045, p. 397. In this regard, the Secretary-General received, on 30 August 1977, a declaration from the Government of Israel identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis* , as the one made with regard to the accession by Kuwait (see note 9).

Subsequently, in a notification received on 18 January 1980, the Government of Egypt informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the declaration. The notification indicates 25 January 1980 as the effective date of the withdrawal.

[9] The Secretary-General received, on 12 May 1977 from the Government of Israel, the following communication:

"The instrument deposited by the Government of Kuwait contains a statement of a political character in respect to Israel. In the view of the Government of Israel, this is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements, which are, moreover, in flagrant contradiction to the principles, objects and purposes of the Organization. That pronouncement by the Government of Kuwait cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Kuwait under general international law or under particular treaties. The Government of Israel will, insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Kuwait an attitude of complete reciprocity."

A communication identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis* , was received by the Secretary-General from the Government of Israel, on 15 December 1987, in respect of the declaration made upon accession by Yemen.

8. CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN

New York, 18 December 1979[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 September 1981, in accordance with article 27(1).
REGISTRATION: 3 September 1981, No. 20378.
STATUS: Signatories: 98. Parties: 185.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1249, p. 13.

Note: The Convention was opened for signature at the United Nations Headquarters on 1 March 1980.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Afghanistan	14 Aug 1980	5 Mar 2003
Albania		11 May 1994 a
Algeria		22 May 1996 a
Andorra		15 Jan 1997 a
Angola		17 Sep 1986 a
Antigua and Barbuda		1 Aug 1989 a
Argentina	17 Jul 1980	15 Jul 1985
Armenia		13 Sep 1993 a
Australia[2]	17 Jul 1980	28 Jul 1983
Austria[3]	17 Jul 1980	31 Mar 1982
Azerbaijan		10 Jul 1995 a
Bahamas		6 Oct 1993 a
Bahrain		18 Jun 2002 a
Bangladesh[4]		6 Nov 1984 a
Barbados	24 Jul 1980	16 Oct 1980
Belarus	17 Jul 1980	4 Feb 1981
Belgium[5]	17 Jul 1980	10 Jul 1985
Belize	7 Mar 1990	16 May 1990
Benin	11 Nov 1981	12 Mar 1992
Bhutan	17 Jul 1980	31 Aug 1981
Bolivia	30 May 1980	8 Jun 1990
Bosnia and Herzegovina[6]		1 Sep 1993 d
Botswana		13 Aug 1996 a
Brazil[7]	31 Mar 1981	1 Feb 1984
Brunei Darussalam		24 May 2006 a
Bulgaria[8]	17 Jul 1980	8 Feb 1982
Burkina Faso		14 Oct 1987 a
Burundi	17 Jul 1980	8 Jan 1992
Cambodia[9,10]	17 Oct 1980	15 Oct 1992 a
Cameroon	6 Jun 1983	23 Aug 1994
Canada[11]	17 Jul 1980	10 Dec 1981
Cape Verde		5 Dec 1980 a
Central African Republic		21 Jun 1991 a

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Chad		9 Jun 1995 a
Chile	17 Jul 1980	7 Dec 1989
China[12,13]	17 Jul 1980	4 Nov 1980
Colombia	17 Jul 1980	19 Jan 1982
Comoros		31 Oct 1994 a
Congo	29 Jul 1980	26 Jul 1982
Cook Islands[14]		11 Aug 2006 a
Costa Rica	17 Jul 1980	4 Apr 1986
Côte d'Ivoire	17 Jul 1980	18 Dec 1995
Croatia[6]		9 Sep 1992 d
Cuba	6 Mar 1980	17 Jul 1980
Cyprus[15]		23 Jul 1985 a
Czech Republic[16]		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic People's Republic of Korea[17].		27 Feb 2001 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo	17 Jul 1980	17 Oct 1986
Denmark[18]	17 Jul 1980	21 Apr 1983
Djibouti		2 Dec 1998 a
Dominica	15 Sep 1980	15 Sep 1980
Dominican Republic	17 Jul 1980	2 Sep 1982
Ecuador	17 Jul 1980	9 Nov 1981
Egypt[19]	16 Jul 1980	18 Sep 1981
El Salvador	14 Nov 1980	19 Aug 1981
Equatorial Guinea		23 Oct 1984 a
Eritrea		5 Sep 1995 a
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Ethiopia	8 Jul 1980	10 Sep 1981
Fiji[20]		28 Aug 1995 a
Finland	17 Jul 1980	4 Sep 1986
France[21]	17 Jul 1980	14 Dec 1983
Gabon	17 Jul 1980	21 Jan 1983
Gambia	29 Jul 1980	16 Apr 1993
Georgia		26 Oct 1994 a
Germany[22,23,24]	17 Jul 1980	10 Jul 1985

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)
Ghana	17 Jul 1980	2 Jan 1986
Greece	2 Mar 1982	7 Jun 1983
Grenada	17 Jul 1980	30 Aug 1990
Guatemala	8 Jun 1981	12 Aug 1982
Guinea[25]	17 Jul 1980	9 Aug 1982
Guinea-Bissau	17 Jul 1980	23 Aug 1985
Guyana	17 Jul 1980	17 Jul 1980
Haiti	17 Jul 1980	20 Jul 1981
Honduras	11 Jun 1980	3 Mar 1983
Hungary[26]	6 Jun 1980	22 Dec 1980
Iceland	24 Jul 1980	18 Jun 1985
India	30 Jul 1980	9 Jul 1993
Indonesia	29 Jul 1980	13 Sep 1984
Iraq		13 Aug 1986 a
Ireland[27]		23 Dec 1985 a
Israel[28]	17 Jul 1980	3 Oct 1991
Italy	17 Jul 1980	10 Jun 1985
Jamaica[29]	17 Jul 1980	19 Oct 1984
Japan	17 Jul 1980	25 Jun 1985
Jordan	3 Dec 1980	1 Jul 1992
Kazakhstan		26 Aug 1998 a
Kenya		9 Mar 1984 a
Kiribati		17 Mar 2004 a
Kuwait[30]		2 Sep 1994 a
Kyrgyzstan		10 Feb 1997 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic	17 Jul 1980	14 Aug 1981
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 a
Lebanon		16 Apr 1997 a
Lesotho[31]	17 Jul 1980	22 Aug 1995
Liberia		17 Jul 1984 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya[32]		16 May 1989 a
Liechtenstein[33]		22 Dec 1995 a
Lithuania		18 Jan 1994 a
Luxembourg	17 Jul 1980	2 Feb 1989
Madagascar	17 Jul 1980	17 Mar 1989
Malawi[34]		12 Mar 1987 a
Malaysia[35]		5 Jul 1995 a
Maldives[36]		1 Jul 1993 a
Mali	5 Feb 1985	10 Sep 1985
Malta		8 Mar 1991 a
Marshall Islands		2 Mar 2006 a
Mauritania[37]		10 May 2001 a

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)
Mauritius[38]		9 Jul 1984 a
Mexico	17 Jul 1980	23 Mar 1981
Micronesia (Federated States of)		1 Sep 2004 a
Monaco		18 Mar 2005 a
Mongolia[39]	17 Jul 1980	20 Jul 1981
Montenegro[40]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		21 Jun 1993 a
Mozambique		21 Apr 1997 a
Myanmar		22 Jul 1997 a
Namibia		23 Nov 1992 a
Nepal	5 Feb 1991	22 Apr 1991
Netherlands[41]	17 Jul 1980	23 Jul 1991
New Zealand[42,43,44,45,46]	17 Jul 1980	10 Jan 1985
Nicaragua	17 Jul 1980	27 Oct 1981
Niger[47]		8 Oct 1999 a
Nigeria	23 Apr 1984	13 Jun 1985
Norway	17 Jul 1980	21 May 1981
Oman		7 Feb 2006 a
Pakistan		12 Mar 1996 a
Panama	26 Jun 1980	29 Oct 1981
Papua New Guinea		12 Jan 1995 a
Paraguay		6 Apr 1987 a
Peru	23 Jul 1981	13 Sep 1982
Philippines	15 Jul 1980	5 Aug 1981
Poland[48]	29 May 1980	30 Jul 1980
Portugal[12,49]	24 Apr 1980	30 Jul 1980
Republic of Korea[50]	25 May 1983	27 Dec 1984
Republic of Moldova		1 Jul 1994 a
Romania[51]	4 Sep 1980	7 Jan 1982
Russian Federation[52]	17 Jul 1980	23 Jan 1981
Rwanda	1 May 1980	2 Mar 1981
Samoa		25 Sep 1992 a
San Marino	26 Sep 2003	10 Dec 2003
Sao Tome and Principe	31 Oct 1995	3 Jun 2003
Saudi Arabia	7 Sep 2000	7 Sep 2000
Senegal	29 Jul 1980	5 Feb 1985
Serbia[6]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		5 May 1992 a
Sierra Leone	21 Sep 1988	11 Nov 1988
Singapore[53]		5 Oct 1995 a
Slovakia[16]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[6]		6 Jul 1992 d
Solomon Islands		6 May 2002 a

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)
South Africa	29 Jan 1993	15 Dec 1995
Spain	17 Jul 1980	5 Jan 1984
Sri Lanka	17 Jul 1980	5 Oct 1981
St. Kitts and Nevis		25 Apr 1985 a
St. Lucia		8 Oct 1982 a
St. Vincent and the Grenadines		4 Aug 1981 a
Suriname		1 Mar 1993 a
Swaziland		26 Mar 2004 a
Sweden[54,55]	7 Mar 1980	2 Jul 1980
Switzerland[56]	23 Jan 1987	27 Mar 1997
Syrian Arab Republic		28 Mar 2003 a
Tajikistan		26 Oct 1993 a
Thailand[57]		9 Aug 1985 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[6]		18 Jan 1994 d
Timor-Leste		16 Apr 2003 a
Togo		26 Sep 1983 a
Trinidad and Tobago	27 Jun 1985	12 Jan 1990
Tunisia	24 Jul 1980	20 Sep 1985
Turkey		20 Dec 1985 a
Turkmenistan		1 May 1997 a
Tuvalu		6 Oct 1999 a
Uganda	30 Jul 1980	22 Jul 1985
Ukraine	17 Jul 1980	12 Mar 1981
United Arab Emirates[58]		6 Oct 2004 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[13,59,60,61]	22 Jul 1981	7 Apr 1986
United Republic of Tanzania	17 Jul 1980	20 Aug 1985
United States of America	17 Jul 1980	
Uruguay	30 Mar 1981	9 Oct 1981
Uzbekistan		19 Jul 1995 a
Vanuatu		8 Sep 1995 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	17 Jul 1980	2 May 1983
Viet Nam	29 Jul 1980	17 Feb 1982
Yemen[62]		30 May 1984 a
Zambia	17 Jul 1980	21 Jun 1985
Zimbabwe		13 May 1991 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ALGERIA[63]

Reservations:

Article 2:

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria declares that it is prepared to apply the provisions of this article on condition that they do not conflict with the provisions of the Algerian Family Code.

Article 9, paragraph 2:

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria wishes to express its reservations concerning the provisions of article 9, paragraph 2, which are incompatible with the provisions of the Algerian Nationality code and the Algerian Family Code.

The Algerian Nationality code allows a child to take the nationality of the mother only when:

- the father is either unknown or stateless;
- the child is born in Algeria to an Algerian mother and a foreign father who was born in Algeria;
- moreover, a child born in Algeria to an Algerian mother and a foreign father who was not born on Algerian territory may, under article 26 of the Algerian Nationality Code, acquire the nationality of the mother providing the Ministry of Justice does not object.

Article 41 of the Algerian Family Code states that a child is affiliated to its father through legal marriage.

Article 43 of that Code states that `the child is affiliated to its father if it is born in the 10 months following the date of separation or death'.

Article 15, paragraph 4:

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria declares that the provisions of article 15, paragraph 4, concerning the right of women to choose their residence and domicile should not be interpreted in such a manner as to contradict the provisions of chapter 4 (art. 37) of the Algerian Family Code.

Article 16:

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria declares that the provisions of article 16 concerning equal rights for men and women in all matters relating to marriage, both during marriage and at its dissolution, should not contradict the provisions of the Algerian Family Code.

Article 29:

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by article 29, paragraph 1, which states that any dispute between two or more Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention which is not settled by negotiation shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice.

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria holds that no such dispute can be submitted to arbitration or to the Court of International Justice except with the consent of all the parties to the dispute.

ARGENTINA

Reservation:

The Government of Argentina declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 29, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

AUSTRALIA[2]

Reservations:

"The Government of Australia states that maternity leave with pay is provided in respect of most women employed by the Commonwealth Government and the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria. Unpaid maternity leave is provided in respect of all other women employed in the State of New South Wales and elsewhere to women employed under Federal and some State industrial awards. Social Security benefits subject to income tests are available to women who are sole parents.

"The Government of Australia advises that it is not at present in a position to take the measures required by article 11 (2) to introduce maternity leave with pay or with comparable social benefits throughout Australia.

.....

Declaration:

"Australia has a Federal Constitutional System in which Legislative, Executive and Judicial Powers are shared or distributed between the Commonwealth and the Constituent States. The implementation of the Treaty throughout Australia will be effected by the Commonwealth State and Territory Authorities having regard to their respective constitutional powers and arrangements concerning their exercise."

30 August 2000

Reservation:

The Government of Australia advises that it does not accept the application of the Convention in so far as it would require alteration of Defence Force policy which excludes women from combat duties."

AUSTRIA[3]

Reservation:

"Austria reserves its right to apply the provision of Article 11, as far as special protection of working women is concerned within the limits established by national legislation."

BAHAMAS

Reservations:

"The Government of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 2(a), ... article 9, paragraph 2, ... article 16(h), ... [and] article 29, paragraph 1, of the Convention."

BAHRAIN

Reservations:

....the Kingdom of Bahrain makes reservations with respect to the following provisions of the Convention:

- Article 2, in order to ensure its implementation within the bounds of the provisions of the Islamic Shariah;
- Article 9, paragraph 2;
- Article 15, paragraph 4;
- Article 16, in so far as it is incompatible with the provisions of the Islamic Shariah;
- Article 29, paragraph 1.

BANGLADESH[4]

"The Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh does not consider as binding upon itself the provisions of article 2, [... and ...] 16 (1) (c) as they conflict with *Sharia* law based on Holy Quran and Sunna."

BELARUS[52]

BELGIUM[5]

30 April 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalem upon accession:

Belgium has carefully examined the reservation formulated by Brunei Darussalam when it acceded, on 24 May 2006, to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, adopted in New York on 18 December 1979. Belgium notes that the reservation formulated with respect to article 9, paragraph 2, concerns a fundamental provision of the Convention and is therefore incompatible with the object and purpose of that instrument.

In addition, the reservation makes the implementation of the Convention's provisions contingent upon their compatibility with the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and the beliefs and principles of Islam, the official religion of Brunei Darussalam. This creates uncertainty as to which of its obligations under the Convention Brunei Darussalam intends to observe and raises doubts as to Brunei Darussalam's respect for the object and purpose of the Convention.

Belgium recalls that, under article 28, paragraph 2, of the Convention, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention are not permitted. It is in the common interest for all parties to respect the treaties to which they have acceded and for States to be willing to enact such legislative amendments as may be necessary in order to fulfil their treaty obligations. Under customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty is not permitted (article 19 (c)).

In consequence, Belgium objects to the reservation formulated by Brunei Darussalam with respect to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Belgium and Brunei Darussalam. The Convention shall enter into force in its entirety, without Brunei Darussalam benefiting from its reservation.

30 April 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

Belgium has carefully examined the reservation formulated by the Sultanate of Oman when it acceded, on 7 February 2006, to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, adopted in New York on 18 December 1979. Belgium notes that the reservation formulated with respect to article 9, paragraph 2; article 15, paragraph 4; and article 16 concerns fundamental provisions of the Convention and is therefore incompatible with the object and purpose of that instrument.

In addition, the first paragraph of the reservation makes the implementation of the Convention's provisions contingent upon their compatibility with the Islamic sharia and legislation in force in the Sultanate of Oman. This creates uncertainty as to which of its obligations under the Convention the Sultanate of Oman intends to observe and raises doubts as to Oman's respect for the object and purpose of the Convention.

Belgium recalls that, under article 28, paragraph 2, of the Convention, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention are not permitted. It is in the common interest for all parties to respect the treaties to which they have acceded and for States to be willing to enact such legislative amendments as may be necessary in order to fulfil their treaty obligations. Under customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purposeof a treaty is not permitted (article 19 (c)).

In consequence, Belgium objects to the reservation formulated by the Sultanate of Oman with respect to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Belgium and the Sultanate of Oman. The Convention shall enter into force in its entirety, without Oman benefiting from its reservation.

BRAZIL[7]

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"... Brazil does not consider itself bound by article 29, paragraph 1, of the above-mentioned Convention."

BRUNEI DARUSSALAM

Reservations:

"The Government of Brunei Darussalam expresses its reservations regarding those provisions of the said Convention that may be contrary to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islam, the official religion of Brunei Darussalam and, without prejudice to the generality of the said reservations, expresses its reservations regarding paragraph 2 of Article 9 and paragraph 1 of Article 29 of the Convention."

BULGARIA[8]

CANADA[11]

CHILE

Upon signature:

Declaration:

The Government of Chile has signed this Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, mindful of the important step which this document represents, not only in terms of the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women, but also in terms of their full and permanent integration into society in conditions of equality.

The Government is obliged to state, however, that some of the provisions of the Convention are not entirely compatible with current Chilean legislation.

At the same time, it reports the establishment of a Commission for the Study and Reform of the Civil Code, which now has before it various proposals to amend, *inter alia* , those provisions which are not fully consistent with the terms of the Convention.

CHINA

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The People's Republic of China does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 29 of the Convention.

COOK ISLANDS[14]

CUBA

Reservation:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba makes a specific reservation concerning the provisions of article 29 of the Convention inasmuch as it holds that any disputes that may arise between States Parties should be resolved through direct negotiations through the diplomatic channel.

CYPRUS[15]

CZECH REPUBLIC[16]

DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA[17]

Reservations:

"The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph (f) of article 2, paragraph 2 of article 9 and paragraph 1 of article 29 of [the Convention]."

EGYPT[19]

Reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

[.....]

In respect of article 16

Reservation to the text of article 16 concerning the equality of men and women in all matters relating to marriage and family relations during the marriage and upon its dissolution, without prejudice to the Islamic *Sharia's* provisions whereby women are accorded rights equivalent to those of their spouses so as to ensure a just balance between them. This is out of respect for the sacrosanct nature of the firm religious beliefs which govern marital relations in Egypt and which may not be called in question and in view of the fact that one of the most important bases of these relations is an equivalency of rights and duties so as to ensure complementary which guarantees true equality between the spouses. The provisions of the *Sharia* lay down that the husband shall pay bridal money to the wife and maintain her fully and shall also make a payment to her upon divorce, whereas the wife retains full rights over her property and is not obliged to spend anything on her keep. The *Sharia* therefore restricts the wife's rights to divorce by making it contingent on ajudge's ruling, whereas no such restriction is laid down in the case of the husband.

In respect of article 29:

The Egyptian delegation also maintains the reservation contained in article 29, paragraph 2, concerning the right of a State signatory to the Convention to declare that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of that article concerning the submission to an arbitral body of any dispute which may arise between States concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention. This is in order to avoid being bound by the system ofarbitration in this field.

Reservation made upon ratification:

General reservation on article 2

The Arab Republic of Egypt is willing to comply with the content of this article, provided that such compliance does not run counter to the Islamic *Sharia* .

EL SALVADOR

Upon signature:

Upon ratification of the Convention, the Government of El Salvador will make the reservation provided for in article 29.

Upon ratification:

Reservation:

With reservation as to the application of the provision of article 29, paragraph 1.

ETHIOPIA

Reservation:

Socialist Ethiopia does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 29 of the Convention.

FIJI[20]

FRANCE[21]

Upon signature:

The Government of the French Republic declares that article 9 of the Convention must not be interpreted as precluding the application of the second paragraph of article 96 of the code of French nationality.

[All other declarations and reservations were confirmed in substance upon ratification.]

Upon ratification:

Declarations:

The Government of the French Republic declares that the preamble to the Convention in particular the eleventh preambular paragraph contains debatable elements which are definitely out of place in this text.

The Government of the French Republic declares that the term "family education" in article 5 (b) of the Convention must be interpreted as meaning public education concerning the family and that, in any event, article 5 will be applied subject to respect for article 17 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and article 8 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

The Government of the French Republic declares that no provision of the Convention must be interpreted as prevailing over provisions of French legislation which are more favourable to women than to men.

Reservations:

.....

Article 14

1. The Government of the French Republic declares that article 14, paragraph 2 (c), should be interpreted as guaranteeing that women who fulfil the conditions relating to family or employment required by French legislation for personal participation shall acquire their own rights within the framework of social security.

2. The Government of the French Republic declares that article 14, paragraph 2 (h), of the Convention should not be interpreted as implying the actual provision, free of charge, of the services mentioned in that paragraph.

Article 16 1 (g)

The Government of the French Republic enters a reservation concerning the right to choose a family namementioned in article 16, paragraph 1 (g), of the Convention.

Article 29

The Government of the French Republic declares, in pursuance of article 29, paragraph 2, of the Convention, that it will not be bound by the provisions of article 29, paragraph 1.

GERMANY[22,23]

Declaration:

The right of peoples to self-determination, as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and in the International Covenants of 19 December 1966, applies to all peoples and not only to those living 'under alien and colonial domination and foreign occupation'. All peoples thus have the inalienable right freely to determine their political status and freely to pursue their economic, social and cultural development. The Federal Republic of Germany would be unable to recognize as legally valid an interpretation of the right to self-determination which contradicts the unequivocal wording of the Charter of the United Nations and of the two International Covenants of 19 December 1966 on Civil and Political Rights and on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. It will interpret the 11th paragraph of the Preamble accordingly.

HUNGARY[26]

INDIA

Declarations and reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

Declarations:

"i) With regard to articles 5 (a) and 16 (1) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the Government of the Republic of India declares that it shall abide by and ensure these provisions in conformity with its policy of non-interference in the personal affairs of any Community without its initiative and consent.

"ii) With regard to article 16 (2) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the Government of the Republic of India declares that though in principle it fully supports the principle of compulsory registration of marriages, it is not practical in a vast country like India with its variety of customs, religions and level of literacy."

Reservation:

"With regard to article 29 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the Government of the Republic of India declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of this article."

INDONESIA

"The Government of the Republic of Indonesia does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 29, paragraph 1 of this Convention and takes the position that any dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention may only be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice with the agreement of all the parties to the dispute."

IRAQ[28]

Reservations:

1. Approval of and accession to this Convention shall not mean that the Republic of Iraq is bound by the provisions of article 2, paragraphs (f) and (g), of article 9, paragraphs 1 and 2, nor of article 16 of the Convention. The reservation to this last-mentioned article shall be without prejudice to the provisions of the Islamic *Shariah* according women rights equivalent to the rights of their spouses so as to ensure a just balance between them. Iraq also enters a reservation to article 29, paragraph 1, of this Convention with regard to the principle of international arbitration in connection with the interpretation or application of this Convention.

2. This approval in no way implies recognition of or entry into any relations with Israel.

IRELAND[27]

Reservations:

....

Articles 16, 1 (d) and (f)

Ireland is of the view that the attainment in Ireland of the objectives of the Convention does not necessitate the extension to men of rights identical to those accorded by law to women in respect of the guardianship, adoption and custody of children born out of wedlock and reserves the right to implement the Convention subject to that understanding.

Articles 11 (1) and 13 (a)

Ireland reserves the right to regard the Anti-Discrimination (Pay) Act, 1974 and the Employment Equality Act 1977 and other measures taken in implementation of the European Economic Community standards concerning employment opportunities and pay as sufficient implementation of articles 11,1 (b), (c) and (d).

Ireland reserves the right for the time being to maintain provisions of Irish legislation in the area of social security which are more favourable to women than men.

ISRAEL

Reservations:

"1. The State of Israel hereby expresses its reservation with regard to article 7 (b) of the Convention concerning the appointment of women to serve as judges of religious courts where this is prohibited by the laws of any of the religious communities in Israel. Otherwise, the said article is fully implemented in Israel, in view of the fact that women take a prominent part in all aspect of public life.

"2. The State of Israel hereby expresses its reservation with regard to article 16 of the Convention, to the extent that the laws on personal status which are binding on the various religious communities in Israel do not conform with the provisions of that article."

Declaration:

"3. In accordance with paragraph 2 of article 29 of the Convention, the State of Israel hereby declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of that article."

ITALY

Upon signature:

Reservation:

Italy reserves the right to exercise, when depositing the instrument of ratification, the option provided for in article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969.

JAMAICA[29]

The Government of Jamaica declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 29, paragraph 1, of the Convention."

JORDAN

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

Jordan does not consider itself bound by the following provisions:

1. Article 9, paragraph 2;
2. Article 15, paragraph 4 (a wife's residence is with her husband);
3. Article 16, paragraph (1) (c), relating to the rights arising upon the dissolution of marriage with regard to maintenance and compensation;
4. Article 16, paragraph (1) (d) and (g).

KUWAIT[30,64]

Reservations:

...

2. Article 9, paragraph 2

The Government of Kuwait reserves its right not to implement the provision contained in article 9, paragraph 2, of the Convention, inasmuch as it runs counter to the Kuwaiti Nationality Act, which stipulates that a child's nationality shall be determined by that of his father.

3. Article 16 (f)

The Government of the State of Kuwait declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provision contained in article 16 (f) inasmuch as it conflicts with the provisions of the *Islamic Shariah* , Islam being the official religion of the State.

4. The Government of Kuwait declares that it is not bound by the provision contained in article 29, paragraph 1.

LEBANON[18]

Reservations:

The Government of the Lebanese Republic enters reservations regarding article 9 (2), and article 16 (1) (c) (d) (f) and (g) (regarding the right to choose a family name).

In accordance with paragraph 2 of article 29, the Government of the Lebanese Republic declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of that article.

LESOTHO[30,31]

Reservation:

"The Government of the Kingdom of Lesotho declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 2 to the extent that it conflicts with Lesotho's constitutional stipulations relative to succession to the throne of the Kingdom of Lesotho and law relating to succession to chieftainship."

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA[32]

Reservation:

1. Article 2 of the Convention shall be implemented with due regard for the peremptory norms of the Islamic *Shariah* relating to determination of the inheritance portions of the estate of a deceased person, whether female or male.
2. The implementation of paragraph 16 (c) and (d) of the Convention shall be without prejudice to any of the rights guaranteed to women by the Islamic *Shariah* .

LIECHTENSTEIN[33]

Reservation concerning article 1:

"In the light of the definition given in article 1 of the Convention, the Principality of Liechtenstein reserves the right to apply, with respect to all the obligations of the Convention, article 3 of the Liechtenstein Constitution."

LUXEMBOURG[65]

MALAWI[34]

MALAYSIA[30,35,54]

Reservations:

The original reservations read as follows:

The Government of Malaysia declares that Malaysia's accession is subject to the understanding that the provisions of the Convention do not conflict with the provisions of the Islamic Sharia' law and the Federal Constitution of Malaysia. With regards thereto, further, the Government of Malaysia does not consider itself bound by the provisions of articles 2 (f), 5 (a), 7 (b), 9 and 16 of the aforesaid Convention.

In relation to article 11, Malaysia interprets the provisions of this article as a reference to the prohibition of discrimination on the basis of equality between men and women only.

On 6 February 1998, the Governnment of Malaysia notified the Secretary-General of a partial withdrawal as follows:

"The Government of Malaysia withdraws its reservation in respect of article 2(f), 9(1), 16(b), 16(d), 16(e) and 16(h).

MALDIVES[30,36]

23 June 1999

Reservations:

"1. The Government of the Republic of Maldives expresses its reservation to article 7 (a) of the Convention, to the extent that the provision contained in the said paragraph conflicts with the provision of article 34 of the Constitution of the Republic of Maldives.

2. The Government of the Republic of Maldives reserves its right to apply article 16 of the Convention concerning the equality of men and women in all matters relating to marriage and family relations without prejudice to the provisions of the Islamic Sharia, which govern all marital and family relations of the 100 percent Muslim population of the Maldives."

MALTA

Reservations:

"*A. Article 11*

The Government of Malta interprets paragraph 1 of article II, in the light of provisions of paragraph 2 of article 4, as not precluding prohibitions, restrictions, or conditions on the employment of women in certain areas, or the work done by them, where this is considered necessary or desirable to protect the health and safety of women or the human foetus, including such prohibitions, restrictions or conditions imposed in consequence of other international obligations of Malta.

"*B. Article 13*

(i) The Government of Malta reserves the right, notwithstanding anything in the Convention, to continue to apply its tax legislation which deems, in certain circumstances, the income of a married woman to be the income of her husband and taxable as such.

(ii) The Government of Malta reserves the right to continue to apply its social security legislation which in certain circumstances makes certain benefits payable to the head of the household which is, by such legislation, presumed to be the husband.

"*C. Articles 13, 15, 16*

While the Government of Malta is committed to remove, in as far as possible, all aspects of family and property law which may be considered as discriminatory to females, it reserves the right to continue to apply present legislation in that regard until such time as the law is reformed and during such transitory period until those laws are completely superseded.

"*D. Article 16*

The Government of Malta does not consider itself bound by sub-paragraph (e) of paragraph (1) of article 16 in so far as the same may be interpreted as imposing an obligation on Malta to legalize abortion."

MAURITANIA[37]

Reservation:

Having seen and examined the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 18 December 1979, have approved and do approve it in each and every one of its parts which are not contrary to Islamic Sharia and are in accordance with our Constitution.

MAURITIUS[38]

Reservation:

"The Government of Mauritius does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 29 of the Convention, in pursuance of paragraph 2 of article 29."

MEXICO

Upon signature:

Declaration:

In signing *ad referendum* the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, which the General Assembly opened for signature by States on 18 December 1979, the Government of the United Mexican States wishes to place on record that it is doing so on the understanding that the provisions of the said Convention, which agree in all essentials with the provisions of Mexican legislation, will be applied in Mexico in accordance with the modalities and procedures prescribed by Mexican legislation and that the granting of material benefits in pursuance of the Convention will be as generous as the resources available to the Mexican State permit.

MICRONESIA (FEDERATED STATES OF)[66]

Reservations:

"1. The Government of the Federated States of Micronesia advises that it is not at present in a position to take the measures either required by Article 11 (1) (d) of the Convention to enact comparable worth legislation, or by Article 11 (2) (b) to enact maternity leave with pay or with comparable social benefits throughout the nation;

2. The Government of the Federated States of Micronesia, in its capacity as trustee of the heritage of diversity within its States under Article V of its Constitution, reserves the right not to apply the provisions of Articles 2 (f), 5, and 16 to the succession of certain well-established traditional titles, and to marital customs that divide tasks or decision-making in purely voluntary or consensual private conduct; and

3. The Government of the Federated States of Micronesia does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 29 (1) of the Convention, and takes the position that any dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention may only be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice with the agreement of all parties to the dispute."

MONACO

Declarations:

1. The implementation of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women does not affect the validity of conventions concluded with France.

2. The Principality of Monaco deems that the aims of the Convention are to eliminate all forms of discrimination against women and to guarantee every individual, irrespective of gender, equality before the law, when the aforementioned aims are in line with the principles stipulated in the Constitution.

3. The Principality of Monaco declares that no provision in the Convention can be interpreted as impeding the provisions of the laws and regulations of Monaco that are more favourable to women than to men.

Reservations:

1. The ratification of the Convention by the Principality of Monaco shall have no effect on the constitutional provisions governing the succession to the throne.

2. The Principality of Monaco reserves the right not to apply the provisions of Article 7, paragraph b, of the Convention regarding recruitment to the police force.

3. The Principality of Monaco does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 9 which are not compatible with its nationality laws.

4. The Principality of Monaco does not consider itself bound by Article 16, paragraph 1 (g), regarding the right to choose one's surname.

5. The Principality of Monaco does not consider itself bound by Article 16, paragraph 1 (e), to the extent that the latter can be interpreted as forcing the legalization of abortion or sterilization.

6. The Principality of Monaco reserves the right to continue to apply its social security laws which, in certain circumstances, envisage the payment of certain benefits to the head of the household who, according to this legislation, is presumed to be the husband.

7. The Principality of Monaco declares, in conformity with the provisions of Article 29, paragraph 2, that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of the first paragraph of this article.

MONGOLIA[39]

MOROCCO

Declarations:

1. With regard to article 2:

The Government of the Kingdom of Morocco express its readiness to apply the provisions of this article provided that:

- They are without prejudice to the constitutional requirement that regulate the rules of succession to the throne of the Kingdom of Morocco;
- They do not conflict with the provisions of the Islamic Shariah. It should be noted that certain of the provisions contained in the Moroccan Code of Personal Status according women rights that differ from the rights conferred on men may not be infringed upon or abrogated because they derive primarily from the Islamic Shariah, which strives, among its other objectives, to strike a balance between the spouses in order to preserve the coherence of family life.

2. With regard to article 15, paragraph 4:

The Government of the Kingdom of Morocco declares that it can only be bound by the provisions of this paragraph, in particular those relating to the right of women to choose their residence and domicile, to the extent that they are not incompatible with articles 34 and 36 of the Moroccan Code of Personal Status.

Reservation:

1. With regard to article 9, paragraph 2:

The Government of the Kingdom of Morocco makes a reservation with regard to this article in view of the fact that the Law of Moroccan Nationality permits a child to bear the nationality of its mother only in the cases where it is born to an unknown father, regardless of place of birth, or to a stateless father, when born in Morocco, and it does so in order to guarantee to each child its right to a nationality. Further, a child born in Morocco of a Moroccan mother and a foreign father may acquire the nationality of its mother bydeclaring, within two years of reaching the age of majority, its desire to acquire that nationality, provided that, on making such declaration, its customary and regular residence is in Morocco.

1. With regard to article 16:

The Government of the Kingdom of Morocco makes a reservation with regard to the provisions of this article, particularly those relating to the equality of men and women, in respect of rights and responsibilities on entry into and at dissolution of marriage. Equality of this kind is considered incompatible with the Islamic Shariah, which guarantees to each of the spouses rights and responsibilities within a framework of equilibrium and complementary in order to preserve the sacred bond of matrimony.

The provisions of the Islamic Shariah oblige the husband to provide a nuptial gift upon marriage and to support his family, while the wife is not required by law to support the family.

Further, at dissolution of marriage, the husband is obliged to pay maintenance. In contrast, the wife enjoys complete freedom of disposition of her property during the marriage and upon its dissolution without supervision by the husband, the husband having no jurisdiction over his wife's property.

For these reasons, the Islamic Shariah confers the right of divorce on a woman only by decision of a Shariah judge.

1. With regard to article 29:

The Government of the Kingdom of Morocco does not consider itself bound by the first paragraph of this article, which provides that `Any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the present Convention which is not settled by negotiation shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration.

The Government of the Kingdom of Morocco is ofthe view that any dispute of this kind can only be referred to arbitration by agreement of all the parties to the dispute.

MYANMAR

Reservation:

Article 29

"[The Government of Myanmar] does not consider itself bound by the provision set forth in the said article."

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"During the preparatory stages of the present Convention and in the course of debates on it in the General Assembly the position of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands was that it was not desirable to introduce political considerations such as those contained in paragraphs 10 and 11 of the preamble in a legal instrument of this nature. Moreover, the considerations are not directly related to the achievement of total equality between men and women. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that it must recall its objections to the said paragraphs in the preamble at this occasion."

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations made by Bangladesh regarding article 2, article 13 (a) and article 16, paragraph 1 (c) and (f), by Egypt regarding article 2, article 9 and article 16, by Brazil regarding article 15, paragraph 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (a), (c), (g), and (h), by Iraq regarding article 2, sub-paragraphs (f) and (g), article 9 and article 16, by Mauritius regarding article 11, paragraph 1 (b) and (d), and article 16, paragraph 1 (g), by Jamaica regarding article 9, paragraph 2, by the Republic of Korea regarding article 9 and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), by Thailand regarding article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 3, and article 16, by Tunisia regarding article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f), (g) and (h), by Turkey regarding article 15, paragraphs 2 and 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya upon accession, and the first paragraph of the reservations made by Malawi upon accession, are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2).

"These objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between Bangladesh, Egypt, Brazil, Iraq, Mauritius, Jamaica, the Republic of Korea, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi and the Kingdom of the Netherlands."

14 July1994

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the declarations made by India regarding article 5 (a) and article 16, paragraph 1. of the Convention are reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2).

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the declaration made by India regarding article 16, paragraph 2, of the Convention is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, para. 2).

The Government of the Kgdom of the Netherlands considers that the declaration made by Morocco expressing the readiness of Morocco to apply the provisions of article 2 provided that they do not conflict with the provisions of the Islamic *Shariah* , is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2).

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the declaration made by Morocco regarding article 15, paragraph 4, of the Convention is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2).

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations made by Morocco regarding article 9, paragraph 2, and article 16 of the Convention are reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2).

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Maldives [...]. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers the said reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the above-mentioned declarations and reservations.

These objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between India, Morocco, the Maldives and the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

16 January 1996

With regard to the reservations made by Kuwait upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers the reservations made by Kuwait incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2).

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the [said] reservations. These objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Kuwait and the Kingdom of the Netherlands."

15 October 1996

With regard to the reservations made by Malaysia upon accession:

"The Governmentof the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers ... that such reservations, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention by invoking the general principles of national law and the Constitution, may raise doubts as to the commitment of this State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties should be respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands further considers that the reservations made by Malaysia regarding article 2 (f), article 5 (a), article 9 and article 16 of the Convention are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Malaysia."

1 November 1996

With regard to the reservations made by Fiji upon accession and Lesotho upon ratification:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made for Malaysia.]

20 November 1996

With regard to the reservations made by Singapore upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands ... considers:

- that the reservation under (1) is incompatible with the purpose of the Convention;
- that the reservation under (2) suggests a distinction between migrating men and migrating women, and by that is an implicit reservation regarding article 9 of the Convention, which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention;
- that the reservation under (3), particularly the last part "...and considers that legislation in respect of article 11 is unnecessary for the minority of women who do not fall within the ambit of Singapore's employment legislation" is a reservation, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention by invoking the general principles of its national law, and in this particular case to exclude the application of the said article for a specific category of women, and therefore may raise doubts as to the commitment of this State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties should be respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties;

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Singapore and the Kingdom of the Netherlands."

30 May 1997

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made for Malaysia.]

1 July 1997

With regard to the reservations made by Algeria upon accession:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made for Malaysia.]

15 May 1998

With regard to the reservations regading article 9, paragraph 2, and article 16 first paragraph (c), (d), (f) and (g) made by Lebanon upon accession:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made for Kuwait.]

18 September 2001

With regard to the reservations made by Saudi Arabia upon ratification:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Government of Saudi Arabia at the time of its [ratification of] the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservation concning the national law of Saudi Arabia, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention by invoking national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of this State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands furthermore considers that the reservation made by Saudi Arabia regarding article 9, paragraph 2, of the Convention is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that according to paragraph 2 of Article 28 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party should be respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties. The Government of the Kingdomof the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Saudi Arabia to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Saudi Arabia."

With regard to the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea regarding article 2, paragraph (f), and article 9, paragraph 2, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women made at the time of its accession to the said Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea regarding article 2, paragraph (f), and article 9, paragraph 2, of the Convention are reservations incompatible with theject and purpose of the Convention. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to paragraph 2 of Article 28 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to take all appropriate measures, including legislation to comply with their obligations.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the afore-said reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea."

8 February 2002

With regard to the reservation made by Mauritania upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservation made by the Government of Mauritania at the time of its accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and considers that the reservation concerning the Islamic Sharia and the national law of Mauritania, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention by invoking the Sharia and national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of this State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to paragraph 2 of Article 28 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Mauritania to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Mauritania."

22 November 2002

With regard to the reservations made by Bahrain upon accession:

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Government of Bahrain at the time of its accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations with respect to article 9, paragraph 2, and article 15, paragraph 4, of the Convention are reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Furthermore, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations with respect to articles 2 and 16 of the Convention, concerning the Islamic Shariah of Bahrain, reservations which seek to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention by invoking the Islamic Shariah, may raise doubts as to the commitment of this State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to paragraph 2 of Article 28 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared toundertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Bahrain to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Bahrain.

27 May 2003

With regard to the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic at the time of its accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations with respect to article 2, article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), of the Convention are reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Furthermore, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservation with respect to article 16, paragraph 2, of the Convention, concerning the Islamic Shariah of the Syrian Arab Republic, a reservation which seeks to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention by invoking the Islamic Shariah, may raise doubts as to the commitment of this State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to paragraph 2 of article 28 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all Pares and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Syrian Arab Republic."

31 May 2005

With regard to the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates upon accession:

"The Government of the Netherlands has examined the reservation made by the United Arab Emirates to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

The application of the Articles 2 (f), 15 (2) and 16 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women has been made subject to religious considerations. This makes it unclear to what extent the United Arab Emirates considers itself bound by the obligations of the treaty and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the United Arab Emirates to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

It is of the common interest of States that all parties respect treaties to which they have chosen to become parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation which is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted (Art. 19 c).

The Government of the Netherlands therefore objects to the reservation made by the United Arab Emirates to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the United Arab Emirates and the Kgdom of the Netherlands, without the United Arab Emirates benefiting from its reservation."

19 July 2006

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

"The Government of the Netherlands has examined the reservation made by Oman to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations with respect to article 9, paragraph 2; article 15, paragraph 4; and article 16, of the Convention are reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Furthermore, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that with the first part of the reservation the application of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women is made subject to the provisions of the Islamic sharia and legislation in force in the Sultanate of Oman. This makes it unclear to what extent Oman considers itself bound by the obligations of the treaty and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of Oman to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to paragraph 2 of article 28 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaidreservations made by the Government of Oman to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Oman."

11 April 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Brunéi Darussalam upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservation with respect to article 9, paragraph 2, of the Convention is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Furthermore, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that with the first reservation the application of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women is made subject to the beliefs and principles of Islam and the provisions of constitutional law in force in Brunei Darussalam. This makes it unclear to what extent Brunei Darussalam considers itself bound by the obligations of the Convention and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of Brunei Darussalam to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to paragraph 2 of article 28 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Brunei Darussalam to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Brunei."

NEW ZEALAND[42,43,44]

Reservation:

...

"The Government of the Cook Islands reserves the right not to apply article 2 (f) and article 5 (a) to the extent that the customs governing the inheritance of certain Cook Islands chief titles may be inconsistent with those provisions."

NIGER[47]

Reservations:

Article 2, paragraphs (d) and (f)

The Government of the Republic of the Niger expresses reservations with regard to article 2, paragraphs (d) and (f), concerning the taking of all appropriate measures to abolish all customs and practices which constitute discrimination against women, particularly in respect of succession.

Article 5, paragraph (a)

The Government of the Republic of the Niger expresses reservations with regard to the modification of social and cultural patterns of conduct of men and women.

Article 15, paragraph 4

The Government of the Republic of the Niger declares that it can be bound by the provisions of this paragraph, particularly those concerning the right of women to choose their residence and domicile, only to the extent that these provisions refer only to unmarried women.

Article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (e) and (g)

The Government of the Republic of the Niger expresses reservations concerning the above-referenced provisions of article 16, particularly those concerning the same rights and responsibilities during marriage and at its dissolution, the same rights to decide freely and responsibly on the number and spacing of their children, and the right to choose a family name.

The Government of the Republic of the Niger declares that the provisions of article 2, paragraphs (d) and (f), article 5, paragraphs (a) and (b), article 15, paragraph 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (e) and (g), concerning family relations, cannot be applied immediately, as they are contrary to existing customs and practices which, by their nature, can be modified only with the passage of time and the evolution of society and cannot, therefore, be abolished by an act of authority.

Article 29

The Government of the Republic of the Niger expresses a reservation concerning article 29, paragraph 1, which provides that any dispute between two or more States concerning the interpretation or application of the present Convention which is not settled by negotiation shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration.

In the view of the Government of the Niger, a dispute of this nature can be submitted to arbitration only with the consent of all the parties to the dispute.

Declaration

The Government of the Republic of the Niger declares that the term "family education" which appears in article 5, paragraph (b), of the Convention should be interpreted as referring to public education concerning the family, and that in any event, article 5 would be applied in compliance with article 17 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

OMAN

Reservations:

1. All provisions of the Convention not in accordance with the provisions of the Islamic sharia and legislation in force in the Sultanate of Oman;
2. Article 9, paragraph 2, which provides that States Parties shall grant women equal rights with men with respect to the nationality of their children;
3. Article 15, paragraph 4, which provides that States Parties shall accord to men and women the same rights with regard to the law relating to the movement of persons and the freedom to choose their residence and domicile;
4. Article 16, regarding the equality of men and women, and in particular subparagraphs (a), (c), and (f) (regarding adoption).
5. The Sultanate is not bound by article 29, paragraph 1, regarding arbitration and the referral to the International Court of Justice of any dispute between two or more States which is not settled by negotiation.

PAKISTAN[30,49,55]

Declaration:

"The accession by [the] Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the [said Convention] is subject to the provisions of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan."

Reservation:

"The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 29 of the Convention."

POLAND[48]

PORTUGAL

26 October 1994

With regard to the reservations made by Maldives upon accession:

"The Government of Portugal considers that the reservations formulated by the Maldives are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and they are inadmissible under article19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Furthermore, the Government of Portugal considers that these reservations cannot alter or modify in any respect the obligations arising from the Convention for any State party thereto."

18 July 2001

With regard to the reservations made by Saudi Arabia upon ratification :

"The Government of the Portuguese Republic has examined the reservation made on 7 September by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (New York, 18 December 1979), regarding any interpretation of the provisions of the Convention that is incompatible with the precept of Islamic law and the Islamic religion. It has also examined the reservation to article 9.2 of the Convention.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic is of the view that the first reservation refers in general terms to the Islamic law, failing to specify clearly its content and, therefore, leaving the other State parties with doubts as to the real extent of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia's commitment to the Convention.

Furthermore, it also considers the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia incompatible with the objective and purpose of the aforesaid Convention, for it refers to the whole of the Convention, and it seriously limits or even excludes its application on a vaguely defined basis, such as the global reference to the Islamic law.

Regarding the reservation to article 9.2, the Government of the Portuguese Republic is of the view that the said reservation intends to exclude one of the obligations of non-discrimination, which is the essnce of the Convention.

Therefore, the Government of the Portuguese Republic objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Portuguese Republic and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia."

4 March 2002

With regard to the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon accession :

"The Government of the Portuguese Republic has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (New York, 18 December 1979) on 27 February 2001 in respect of articles 2 (f) and 9.2 of the Convention.

Recalling that, according tp paragraph 2 of Article 28 of the Convention a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted, the Government of the Portuguese Republic objects to the said reservations.

In fact, the reservation relating to article 2 (f) refers to a basic aspect of the Convention, namely the compromise to enact legislation to abolish all existing legal practices discriminating against women.

Regarding the reservation to article 9.2, the Government of the Portuguese Republic is of the view that the said reservation intends to exclude one of the specific obligations of non-discrimination, which is the essence of the Convention.

It is in the common interests of States that Treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected by all parties and that the States are prepared to take all appropriate measures, including legislation to comply with their obligations.

Therefore, the Government of the Portuguese Republic objects to the afore mentioned reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the Convention on the Elination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Portuguese Republic and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea."

With regard to the reservation made by Mauritania upon accession:

"The Government of the Portuguese Republic has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (New York, 18 December 1979) on 10 May 2001 in respect of any interpretation of the provisions of the Convention that it is incompatible with the precept of Islamic law and its Constitution.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic is of the view that the said reservation refers in a general manner to national law, failing to specify clearly its content and, therefore, leaving the other State parties with doubts as to the real extent of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania's commitment to the Convention.

Furthermore it also considers the reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania incompatible with the objective and purpose of the aforesaid Convention, and it seriously limits or even excludes its application on a vaguely defined basis, such as the global reference to the Islamic law.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Portuguese Republic and the Islamic Republic of Mauritania."

28 November 2005

With regard to the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates upon accession:

"The Portuguese Government has carefully examined the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates upon its accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW).

Most of these reservations concern fundamental provisions of the Convention, such as articles 2 (f), 9, 15 (2) and 16, since they outline the measures which a State Party is required to take in order to implement the Convention, cover the fundamental rights of women and deal with the key elements for the elimination of discrimination against women.

Portugal considers that such reservations, consisting of references to the precepts of the Shariah and to national legislation, create serious doubts as to the commitment of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the Convention and to the extent it has accepted the obligations imposed by it and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international law.

It is in the common interest of all States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic, therefore, objects to the above reservations made by the United Arab Emirates to the CEDAW.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Portugal and the United Arab Emirates."

30 January 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

"The first reservation concerns "all provisions of the Convention not in accordance with the provisions of the Islamic sharia and legislation in force in the Sultanate of Oman". Portugal considers that this reservation is too general and vague and seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on an unilateral basis that is not authorised by it. Moreover, this reservation creates doubts as to the commitment of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contributes to undermining the basis of international law. It is in the common interest of allStates that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The second, third and fourth reservations concern fundamental provisions of the Convention, such as articles 9 (2), 15 (4) and 16, that cover the fundamental rights of women and deal with the key elements for the elimination of discrimination against women on the basis of sex. These reservations are thus incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and are not permitted under article 28 (2) of the CEDAW.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic, therefore, objects to the above mentioned reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman to the CEDAW.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Portugal and Oman."

With regard to the reservationsmade by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

"The reservation concerning the "provisions of the said Convention that may be contrary to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islam, the official religion of Brunei Darussalam" is too general and vague and seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis that is not authorised by it. Moreover, this reservation creates doubts as to the commitment of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contributes to undermining the basis of international law. It is in the common interest of all States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The reservation concerning article 9 (2) undermines a key provision of the Convention concerning the elimination of discrimination against women on the bsis of sex. This reservation is thus incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and is not permitted under article 28 (2) of the CEDAW.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic, therefore, objects to the above mentioned reservations made by the Government of Brunei Darussalam to the CEDAW.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Portugal and Brunei Darussalam."

REPUBLIC OF KOREA[50]

Upon signature:

Reservation:

"1. The Government of the Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 9 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women of 1979.

"2. Bearing in mind the fundamental principles as embodied in the said Convention, the Government of the Republic of Korea has recently established the Korea Women's welfare and social activities. A committee under the chairmanship of the prime minister will shortly be set up to consider and coordinate overall policies on women.

"3. The Government of the Republic of Korea will make continued efforts to take further measures in line with the provisions stipulated in the Convention."

Upon ratification:

Reservation :

"The Government of the Republic of Korea, having examined the said Convention, hereby ratifies the Convention considering itself not bound by the provisions of [...] sub-paragraph [...] (g) of paragraph 1 of Article 16 of the Convention."

ROMANIA[51]

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[52]

SAUDI ARABIA

Reservations:

"1. In case of contradiction between any term of the Convention and the norms of islamic law, the Kingdom is not under obligation to observe the contradictory terms of the Convention.

2. The Kingdom does not consider itself bound by paragraphe 2 of article 9 of the Convention and paragraph 1 of article 29 of the Convention."

SINGAPORE[30,53,55]

Reservations:

(1) In the context of Singapore's multi-racial and multi-religious society and the need to respect the freedom of minorities to practise their religious and personal laws, the Republic of Singapore reserves the right not to apply the provisions of articles 2 and 16 where compliance with these provisions would be contrary to their religious or personal laws.

(2) [...]

(3) Singapore interprets article 11, paragraph 1 in the light of the provisions of article 4, paragraph 2 as not precluding prohibitions, restrictions or conditions on the employment of women in certain areas, or on work done by them where this is considered necessary or desirable to protect the health and safety of women or the human foetus, including such prohibitions, restrictions or conditions imposed in consequence of other international obligations of Singapore and considers that legislation in respect of article 11 is unnecessary for the minority of women who do not fall within the ambit of Singapore's employmentlegislation.

(4) The Republic of Singapore declares, in pursuance of article 29, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it will not be bound by the provisions of article 29, paragraph 1.

SLOVAKIA[16]

SPAIN

Declaration:

The ratification of the Convention by Spain shall not affect the constitutional provisions concerning succession to the Spanish crown.

SWEDEN

17 March 1986

"The Government of Sweden considers that [the following reservations] are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2) and therefore objects to them:

- Thailand regarding article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 3 and article 16;
- Tunisia regarding article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f), (g) and (h).
- Bangladesh regarding article 2, article 13 (a) and article 16, paragraph 1 (c) and (f);
- Brazil regarding article 15, paragraph 4 and article 16, paragraph 1 (a), (c), (g) and (h);

"Indeed the reservations in question, if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to everything the Convention stands for. It should also be borne in mind that the principles of the equal rights of men and women and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations as one of its purposes, in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 and in various multilateral instruments, to which Thailand, Tunisia and Bangladesh are parties.

"The Government of Sweden furthermore notes that, as a matter of principle, the same objection could be made to the reservations made by:

- Egypt regarding article 2, article 9, paragraph 2, and article 16,
- Mauritius regarding article 11, paragraph 1 (b) and (d), and article 16, paragraph 1 (g),
- Jamaica regarding article 9, paragraph 2
- Republic of Korea regarding article 9 and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g)
- New Zealand in respect of the Cook Islands regarding article 2, paragraph (f) and article 5, paragraph (a).

"In this context the Government of Sweden wishes to take this opportunity tomake the observation that the reason why reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are not acceptable is precisely that otherwise they would render a basic international obligation of a contractual nature meaningless. Incompatible reservations, made in respect of the Convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women, do not only cast doubts on the commitments of the reserving states to the objects and purpose of this Convention, but moreover, contribute to undermine the basis of international contractual law. It is in the common interest of states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties also are respected, as to object and purpose, by other parties."

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, from the Government of Sweden, objections of the same nature as the one above with regard to reservations made by the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

- 12 March 1987 with regard to the reservation made by Iraq in respect of article 2, paragraph (f) and (g), article 9, paragraph 1, and article 16;
- 15 April 1988 with regard to the first reservations made by Malawi;
- 25 May 1990 with regard to the reservation made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya;
- 5 February 1993 with regard to the reservations made by Jordan in respect of article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, the wording of article 16 (c), and article 16 (d) and (g);
- 26 October 1994 with regard to the reservations made by Maldives upon accession. *The Government of Sweden also stated that:* "The Government of Sweden therefore objects to these reservations and considers that they constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Sweden and the Republic of Maldives.";
- 17 January 1996 with regard to the reservations made by Kuwait upon accession;
- 27 January 1998 with regard to the reservations made by Lebanon upon accession.
- 27 April 2000 with regard to the reservations to articles 2 , 5, 15 and 16 made by Niger upon accession.

30 March 2001

With regard to the reservations made by Saudi Arabia upon ratification:

"The Government of Swedehas examined the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia at the time of its ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, as to any interpretation of the provisions of the Convention that is incompatible with the norms of Islamic law.

The Government of Sweden is of the view that this general reservation, which does not clearly specify the provisions of the convention to which it applies and the extent of the derogation therefrom, raises doubts as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the object and purpose of the Convention.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have been chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to customary law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid general reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the Kingdom of Sweden, without the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia benefiting from the said reservation".

25 July 2001

With regard to the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea at the time of its accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, regarding articles 2 (f) and 9 (2) of the Convention.

The reservation in question, if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. It should be borne in mind that the principles of the equal rights of men and women and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex are set forth in te Charter of the United Nations as one of the purposes of the organisation, as well as in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

According to Article 28 (2) of the Convention, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the Conventionon the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and considers the reservation null and void. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without the Democratic People's Republic of Korea benefiting from its reservation".

21 January 2002

With regard to the reservation made by Mauritania upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by Mauritania upon acceding to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

The Government of Sweden notes that the Convention is being made subject to a general reservation of unlimited scope referring to the contents of Islamic Sharia and to existing legislation in Mauritania.

The Government of Sweden is of the view that this reservation which does not clearly specify the provisions of the Convention to which it applies, and the extent of the derogation therefrom, raises serious doubts as to the commitment of Mauritania to the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of Sweden would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Mauritania to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

The objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Mauritania and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Mauritania benefiting from its reservation."

27 November 2002

With regard to the reservation made by Bahrain upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by Bahrain upon acceding to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, regarding articles 2, 9(2), 15(4) and 16.

The reservation to articles 9(2) and 15(4), if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. It should be borne in mind that the principles of the equal rights of men and women and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations as one of the purposes of the organisation, as well as in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

The reservation to articles 2 and 16 make general references to Islamic sharia. The Government of Sweden is of the view that, in absence of further clarification, this reservation which does not clearly specify the extent of Bahrain's derogation from the provisions in question raises serious doubts as to the commitment of Bahrain to the object and purpose of the Convention.

According to article 28(2) of the Convention, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Bahrain to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women and considers the reservation null and void.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Bahrain and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Bahrain benefiting from its reservation."

11 July 2003

With regard to the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon acceding to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women regarding article 2, article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4 and article 16, paragraphs 1 (c), (d), (f) (g) and 2 of the Convention.

Article 2 of the Convention is one of the core articles of the Convention. A general reservation to this article seriously raises doubts as to the commitment of the Syrian Arab Republic to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The reservations to articles 9, paragraph 2, article 15,paragraph 4 and article 16, paragraphs 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. It should be borne in mind that the principles of the equal rights of men and women and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations as one of the purposes of the organisation, as well as in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

The reservation to article 16, paragraph 2, makes a general reference to islamic sharia. The Government of Sweden is of the view that in the absence of further clarification, this reservation which does not clearly specify the extent of the Syrian Arab Republic's derogation from the provision in question raises serious doubts as to the commitment of the Syrian Arab Republic to the object and purpose of the Convention.

According to article 28, paragraph 2, of the Convention, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of all States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Syrian Arab Republic and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without the Syrian Arab Republic benefiting from its reservations."

25 August 2005

With regard to the reservations made by Micronesia (Federated States of) upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden is of the view that this reservation raises serious doubts as to the commitment of the Government of Micronesia to the object and purpose of the Convention. The reservation would, if put into practice, result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex. It should be borne in mind that the principles of the equal right of men and women and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations as one of the purposes of the organisation, as well as in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

According to article 28 (2) of the Convention, and to customary law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia to the Convention to the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and considers the reservation null and void. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without the Federated States of Micronesia benefiting from its reservations."

5 October 2005

With regard to the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservations made by United Arab Emirates upon acceding to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, regarding Article 2 (f), 9, 15 (2) and 16.

The Government of Sweden notes that the said articles are being made subject to reservations referring to national legislation and Sharia principles.

The Government of Swedenis of the view that these reservations which do not clearly specify the extent of the United Arab Emirates' derogation from the provisions in question raises serious doubts as to the commitment of the United Arab Emirates to the object and purpose of the Convention. The reservations in question, if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. It should be borne in mind that the principles of the equal rights of women and men and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations as one of the purposes of the organization, as well as in the declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

According to article 28 (2) of the Convention, and to international customary law as codified in the Vienna convention on the Law of the Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the United Arab Emirates to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women and considers them null and void.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Arab Emirates and Sweden. The convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without the United Arab Emirates benefiting from its reservations."

6 February 2007

With regard to the reservations made Oman upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman on 7 February 2006 to the Conventionon the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

The Government of Sweden notes that the Sultanate of Oman gives precedence to the provisions of Islamic Sharia and national legislation over the application of the provisions of the Convention. The Government of Sweden is of the view that this reservation which does not clearly specify the extent of the Sultanate of Oman's derogation from the provisions in question raises serious doubt as to the commitment of the Sultanate of Oman to the object and purpose of the Convention.

Furthermore, the Government of Sweden considers that, regarding the reservations made with respect to articles 9 (2), 15 (4), 16 (a, c, f), if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. It should be borne in mind that the principles of the equal rights of women and men and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations as one of the purposes of the organization, as well as the declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

According to article 28 (2) of the Convention and to international customary law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties, are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and considers them null and void.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Sultanate of Oman and Sweden. The Conventon enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without the Sultanate of Oman benefiting from its reservations."

12 February 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam on 24 May 2006 to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

The Government of Sweden notes that Brunei Darussalam gives precedence to the beliefs and principles of Islam and national legislation over the application of the provisions of the Convention. The Government of Sweden is of the view that this reservation which does not clearly specify the extent of Brunei Darussalam's derogation from the provisions in questions raises serious doubt as to the commitment of Brunei Darussalam to the object and purpose of the Convention.

Furthermore, the Government of Sweden considers that, regarding the reservation made with respect to article 9 (2), if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. It should be borne in mind that the principles of the equal rights of women and men and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations as one of the purposes of the organization, as well as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

According to article 28 (2) of the Convention and to international customary law, as codified in the Vienna convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties, to which they have chosen to become parties, are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

TheGovernment of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by Brunei Darussalam to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and considers them null and void.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Brunei Darussalam and Sweden. The convention enters int force in its entirety between the two States without Brunei Darussalam benefiting from its reservations."

SWITZERLAND[56]

.....

(b) Reservation concerning article 16, paragraph 1 (g):

Said provision shall be applied subject to the regulations on family name (Civil Code, article 160 and article 8 (a), final section);

(c) Reservation concerning article 15, paragraph 2, and article 16, paragraph 1 (h):

Said provisions shall be applied subject to several interim provisions of the matrimonial regime (Civil Code, articles 9 (e) and 10, final section).

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Reservation:

..... subject to reservations to article 2; article 9, paragraph 2, concerning the grant of a woman's nationality to her children; article 15, paragraph 4, concerning freedom of movement and of residence and domicile; article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), concerning equal rights and responsibilities during marriage and at its dissolution with regard to guardianship, the right to choose a family name, maintenance and adoption; article 16, paragraph 2, concerning the legal effect of the betrothal and the marriage of a child, inasmuch as this provision is incompatible with the provisions of the Islamic Shariah; and article 29, paragraph 1, concerning arbitration between States in the event of a dispute.

The accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to this Convention shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or entail entry into any dealings with Israel in the context of the provisions of the Convention..

THAILAND[57]

Declaration:

The Royal Thai Government wishes to express its understanding that the purposes of the Convention are to eliminate discrimination against women and to accord to every person, men and women alike, equality before the law, and are in accordance with the principles prescribed by the Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand.

Reservations:

.....

3. The Royal Thai Government does not consider itself bound by the provisions of [...] article 16 and article 29, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratifica- tion:

"The Republic of Trinidad and Tobago declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 29 (1) of the said Convention, relating to the settlement of disputes."

TUNISIA

1. General declaration:

The Tunisian Government declares that it shall not take any organizational or legislative decision in conformity with the requirements of this Convention where such a decision would conflict with the provisions of chapter I of the Tunisian Constitution.

2. Reservation concerning article 9, paragraph 2:

The Tunisian Government expresses its reservation with regard to the provisions in article 9, paragraph 2 of the Convention, which must not conflict with the provisions of chapter VI of the Tunisian Nationality Code.

3. Reservation concerning article 16, paragraphs (c), (d), (f), (g) and (h):

The Tunisian Government considers itself not bound by article 16, paragraphs (c), (d) and (f) of the Convention and declares that paragraphs (g) and (h) of that article must not conflict with the provisions of the Personal Status Code concerning the granting of family names to children and the acquisition of property through inheritance.

4. Reservation concerning article 29, paragraph 1:

The Tunisian Government declares, in conformity with the requirements of article 29, paragraph 2 of the Convention, that it shall not be bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of that article which specify that any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the present Convention which is not settled by negotiation shall be referred to the International Court of Justice at the request of any one of those parties.

The Tunisian Government considers that such disputes should be submitted for arbitration or consideration by the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all parties to the dispute.

5. Declaration concerning article 15, paragraph4:

In accordance with the provisions of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, dated 23 May 1969, the Tunisian Government emphasizes that the requirements of article 15, paragraph 4, of t Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination against Women, and particularly that part relating to the right of women to choose their residence and domicile, must not be interpreted in a manner which conflicts with the provisions of the Personal Status Code on this subject, as set forth in chapters 23 and 61 of the Code.

TURKEY[67]

The original reservation and declaration read as follows:

Reservations:

"Reservations of the Government of the Republic of Turkey [.....] with respect to article 29, paragraph 1. In pursuance of article 29, paragraph 2 of the Convention, the Government of the Republic of Turkey declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of this article."

[.....]

UKRAINE[52]

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES[58]

Reservations:

The United Arab Emirates makes reservations to articles 2 (f), 9, 15 (2), 16 and 29 (1) of the Convention, as follows:

Article 2 (f)

The United Arab Emirates, being of the opinion that this paragraph violates the rules of inheritance established in accordance with the precepts of the Shariah, makes a reservation thereto and does not consider itself bound by the provisions thereof.

Article 9

The United Arab Emirates, considering the acquisition of nationality an internal matter which is governed, and the conditions and controls of which are established, by national legislation makes a reservation to this article and does not consider itself bound by the provisions thereof.

Article 15 (2)

The United Arab Emirates, considering this paragraph in conflict with the precepts of the Shariah regarding legal capacity, testimony and the right to conclude contracts, makes a reservation to the said paragraph of the said article and does not consider itself bound by the provisions thereof.

Article 16

The United Arab Emirates will abide by the provisions of this article insofar as they are not in conflict with the principles of the Shariah. The United Arab Emirates considers that the payment of a dower and of support after divorce is an obligation of the husband, and the husband has the right to divorce, just as the wife has her independent financial security and her full rights to her property and is not required to pay her husband's or her own expenses out of her own property. The Shariah makes a woman's right to divorce conditional on a judicial decision, in a case in which she has been harmed.

Article 29 (1)

The United Arab Emirates appreciates and respects the functions of this article, which provides: "Any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the present Convention which is not settled by negotiation shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration. If within six months...e parties are unable..." [any one of those parties] "may refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice..." This article, however, violates the general principle that matters are submitted to an arbitration panel by agreement between the parties. In addition, it might provide an opening for certain States to bring other States to trial in defence of their nationals; the case might then be referred to the committee charged with discussing the State reports required by the Convention and a decision might be handed down against the State in question for violating the provisions of the Convention. For these reasons the United Arab Emirates makes a reservation to this article and does not consider itself bound by the provisions thereof.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND[59,60]

Upon signature:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declare that it is their intention to make certain reservations and declarations upon ratification of the Convention.

Upon ratification:

"A. On behalf of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

"(a) The United Kingdom understands the main purpose of the Convention, in the light of the definition contained in Article 1, to be the reduction, in accordance with its terms, of discrimination against women, and does not therefore regard the Convention as imposing any requirement to repeal or modify any existing laws, regulations, customs or practices which provide for women to be treated more favourably than men, whether temporarily or in the longer term; the United Kingdom's undertakings under Article 4, paragraph 1, and other provisions of the Convention are to be construed accordingly.

...

"(c) In the light of the definition contained in Article 1, the United Kingdom's ratification is subject to the understanding that none of its obligations under the Convention shall be treated as extending to the succession to, or possession and enjoyment of, the Throne, the peerage, titles of honour, social precedence or armorial bearings, or as extending to the affairs of religious denominations or orders or any act done for the purpose of ensuring the combat effectiveness of the Armed Forces of the Crown.

"(d) [...]

...

"Article 9

The British Nationality Act 1981, which was brought into force with effect from January 1983, is based on principles which do not allow of any discrimination against women within the meaning of Article 1 as regards acquisition, change or retention of their nationality or as regards the nationality of their children. The United Kingdom's acceptance of Article 9 shall not, how ever, be taken to invalidate the continuation of certain temporary or transitional provisions which will ctinue in force beyond that date.

...

"Article 11

...

"The United Kingdom reserves the right to apply all United Kingdom legislation and the rules of pension schemes affecting retirement pensions, survivors' benefits and other benefits in relation to death or retirement (including retirement on grounds of redundancy), whether or not derived from a Social Security scheme.

"This reservation will apply equally to any future legislation which may modify or replace such legislation, or the rules of pension schemes, on the understanding that the terms of such legislation will be compatible with the United Kingdom's obligations under the Convention.

"The United Kingdom reserves the right to apply the following provisions of United Kingdom legislation concerning the benefits specified:

...

b) increases of benefits for adult dependants under sections 44 to 47, 49 and 66 of the Social Security Act 1975 and under sections 44 to 47, 49 and 66 of the Social Security (Northern Ireland) Act 1975;

...

The United Kingdom reserves the right to apply any non-discriminatory requirement for a qualifying period of employment or insurance for the application of the provisions contained in Article 11 (2).

"Article 15

...

"In relation to Article 15, paragraph 3, the United Kingdom understands the intention of this provision to be that only those terms or elements of a contract or other private instrument which are discriminatory in the sense described are to be deemed null and void, but not necessarily the contract or instrument as a whole.

"Article 16

As regards sub-paragraph 1 (f) of Article 16, the United Kingdom does not regard the reference to the paramountcy of the interests of the children as being directly relevant to the elimination of discrimination against women, and declares in this connection that the legislation of the United Kingdom regulating adoption, while giving a principal position to the promotion of the children's welfare, does not give to the child's interests the same paramount place as in issues concerning custody over children.

...

"B. On behalf of the Isle of Man, the British Virgin Islands, the Falkland Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, and the Turks and Caicos Islands:

[Same reservations as the one made on behalf of the United Kingdom under paragraphs A (a), (c), and (d) except that in the of case d) it applies to the territories and their laws).]

Article 1

[Same reservation as the one made in respect of the United Kingdom except with regard to the absence of a reference to United Kingdom legislation.]

Article 2

[Same reservation as the one made in respect of the United Kingdom except that reference is made to the laws of the territories, and not the laws of the United Kingdom.]

Article 9

[Same reservation as the one made in respect of the United Kingdom.]

Article 11

[Same reservation as those made in respect of the United Kingdom except that a reference is made to the laws of the territories, and not to the laws of the United Kingdom.]

"Also, as far as the territories are concerned, the specific benefits listed and which may be applied under the provisions of these territories' legislation are as follows:

a) social security benefits for persons engaged in caring for a severely disabled person;
b) increases of benefit for adult dependants;
c) retirement pensions and survivors' benefits;
d) family income supplements.

"This reservation will apply equally to any future legislation which may modify or replace any of the provisions specified in sub-paragraphs (a) to (d) above, on the understanding that the terms of such legislation will be compatible with the United Kingdom's obligations under the Convention.

"The United Kingdom reserves the right to apply any non-discriminatory requirement for a qualifying period of employment or insurance for the application of the provisions contained in Article 11 (2)."

Article 13, 15 and 16

[Same reservations as those made on behalf the United Kingdom.]

6 September 2001

With regard to the reservation made by Saudi Arabia upon ratification:

"The Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honour to refer to the reservation made on 7 September 2000 by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, done at New York on 18 December 1979, which reads as follows:

"In case of contradiction between any term of the Convention and the norms of Islamic Law, the Kingdom is not under obligation to observe the contradictory terms of the Convention."

The Government of the United Kingdom note that a reservation which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define for other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government [of] the Kingdom of the Saudi Arabia.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia."

28 November 2001

With regard to the reservation made by Mauritania upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have examined the reservation made by the Government of Mauritania in respect of the Convention, which reads as follows:

'Having seen and examined the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, adopted by the UN General Assembly on 18 December 1979, have approved and do approve it in each and every one of its parts which are not contrary to Islamic Sharia and are in accordance with our Constituti'.

The Government of the United Kingdom note that a reservation to a Convention which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the reservation made by the Government of Mauritania.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Mauritania."

5 March 2002

With regard to the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republique of Korea upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on 27 February in respect of the Convention, which reads as follows:

'The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph (f) of Article 2...of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.'

Paragraph (f) of Article 2 requires States Parties to take all appropriate measures, including legislation, to modify or abolish existing laws, regulations, customs and practices which constitute discrimination against women. The Government of the United Kingdom notes that a reservation which excludes obligations of such a general nature does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea."

26 June 2003

With regard to the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom have examined the reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (New York, 18 December 1979) on 28 March 2003 in respect of Article 2; and Article 16, paragraphs 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), concerning equal rights and responsibilities during marriage and at its dissolution with regard to guardianship, the right to choose a family name, maintenance and adoption; and article 16, paragraph 2, concerning the legal effect of the betrothal and the marriage of a child, inasmuch as this provision is incompatible with the provisions of the Islamic Shariah.

The Government of the United Kingdom note that the Syrian reservation specifies particular provisions of the Convention Articles to which the reservation is addressed. Nevertheless this reservation does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Syrian Arab Republic."

With regard to the reservations made by Bahrain upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom have examined the reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (New York, 18 December 1979) on 18 June 2002 in respect of Article 2, in order to ensure its implementation within the bounds of the provisions of the Islamic Shariah; and Article 16, in so far as it is incompatible with the provisions of the Islamic Shariah.

The Government of the United Kingdom note that a reservation which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Kingdom of Bahrain."

17 August 2005

With regard to the reservations made by the United Arab Emriates upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom have examined the reservations made by the Government of the United Arab Emirates to [the] Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (New York, 18 December 1979) on 6 October 2004 in respect of Articles 2 (f), 15 (2), and 16 on the applicability of Sharia law.

The Government of the United Kingdom note that a reservation which consists of a general reference to a system of law without specifying its contents does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the United Arab Emirates.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United Arab Emirates."

With regard to the reservations made by the Micronesia (Federated States of) upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom have examined the reservations made by the Government of Micronesia to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (New York, 18 December 1979) on 9 September 2004 in respect of Article 11 (1) (d) on the enactment of comparable worth legislation.

The Government of the United Kingdom object to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Micronesia.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Micronesia."

28 February 2007

With regard to the reservations made Oman upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom have examined the reservations made by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (New York, 18 December 1979).

In the view of the Government of the United Kingdom a reservation should clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. A reservation which consists of a general reference to a system of law without specifying its contents does not do so. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the Sultanate of Oman's reservation from "all provisions of the Convention not in accordance with the provisions of the Islamic Sharia and legislation in force in the Sultanate of Oman".

The Government of the United Kingdom further object to the Sultanate of Oman's reservations from Article 15, paragraph 4 and Article 16 of the Convention.

These objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Oman."

14 June 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

"The Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations.....has the honour to refer to the reservations made by the Government of Brunei Darussalam to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Agains Women (New York, 18 December 1979), which read:

‘The Government of Brunei Darussalam expresses its reservations regarding those provisions of the said Convention that may be contrary to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islam, the official religion of Brunei Darussalam and, without prejudice to the generality of the said reservations, expresses its reservations regarding paragraph 2 of Article 9 and paragraph 1 of Article 29 of the Convention.'

In the view of the United Kingdom a reservation should clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. A reservation which consists of a general reference to a system of law without specifying its contents does not do so. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the reservations made by the Government of Brunei Darussalam.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Brunei Darussalam."

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Reservation made upon ratification confirming in substance the reservation made upon signature:

Venezuela makes a formal reservation with regard to article 29, paragraph 1, of the Convention, since it does not accept arbitration or the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention.

VIET NAM

Reservation:

In implementing this Convention, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam will not be bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 article 29.

YEMEN[62]

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 29, paragraph 1, of the said Convention, relating to the settlement of disputes which may arise concerning the application or interpretation of the Convention.

Objections

(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRIA

26 October 1994

With regard to the reservations made by Maldives upon accession:

"The reservation made by the Maldives is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and is therefore inadmissible under article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and shall not be permitted, in accordance with article 28 (2) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. Austria therefore states that this reservation cannot alter or modify in any respect the obligations arising from the Convention for any State Party thereto."

5 June 1997

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

"Austria is of the view that a reservation by which a State limits its responsibilities under the Convention in a general and unspecified manner by invoking internal law creates doubts as to the commitment of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan with its obligations under the Convention, essential for the fulfillment of its object and purpose.

It is in the common interests of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become Parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all Parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

Austria is further of the view that a general reservation of the kind made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, which does not clearly specify the provisions of the Convention to which it applies and the extent of the derogation therefrom, contributes to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

Given the general character of this reservation a final assessment as to its admissibility under international law cannot be made without further clarification.

According to international law a reservation is inadmissible to the extent as its application negatively affects the compliance by a State with its obligations under the Convention essential for the fulfillment of its object and purpose.

Therefore, Austria cannot consider the reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan as admissible unless the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, by providing additional information or through subsequent practice, ensures that the reservation is compatible with the provisions essential for the implementation of the object and purpose of the Convention.

This view by Austria would not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Convention between Pakistan and Austria."

20 February 1998

With regard to reservations made by Lebanon upon accession:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made for Pakistan.]

21 August 2001

With regard to reservations made by Saudi Arabia upon ratification:

"Austria has examined the reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women made by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in its note to the Secretary-General of 7 September 2000.

The fact that the reservation concerning any interpretation of the provisions of the Convention that is incompatible with the norms of Islamic law does not clearly specify the provisions of the Convention to which it applies and the extent of the derogation therefrom raises doubts as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the Convention.

Given the general character of this reservation a final assessment as to its admissibility under international law cannot be made without further clarification. Until the scope of the legal effects of this reservation is sufficiently specified by the Government of Saudi Arabia, Austria considers the reservation as not affecting any provision the implementation of which is essential to fulfilling the object and purpose of the Convention. In Austria's view, however, the reservation in question is inadmissible to the extent that its application negatively affects the compliance by Saudi Arabia with its obligations under the Convention essential for the fulfilment of its object and purpose. Austria does not consider the reservation made by the Government of Saudi Arabia as admissible unless the Government of Saudi Arabia, by providing additional information or through subsequent practice, ensures that the reservation is compatible with the provisions essential for the implementation of the object and purpose of the Convention.

As to the reservation to Paragraph 2 of Article 9 of the Convention Austria is of the view that the exclusion of such an important provision of non-discrimination is not compatible with object and purpose of the Convention. Austria therefore objects to this reservation.

This position, however, does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Convention between Saudi Arabia and Austria."

With regard to reservations made by the Democcratic Republic of Korea upon accession:

"Austria has examined the reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in its note to the Secretary General of 27 February 2001.

Taking into consideration that according to Paragraph 2 of Article 28 of the Convention, reservations which are incompatible with the objective and purpose of the Convention are not acceptable, Austria objects to the reservations in respect of Paragraph f of Article 2 and Paragraph 2 of Article 9.

Both Paragraphs refer to basic aspects of the Convention, that are legislation to abolish existing discrimination against women and a specific form of discrimination, such as the nationality of children.

This position, however, does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Convention between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Austria."

13 February 2002

With regardto the reservation made by Mauritania upon accession:

"The Government of Austria has examined the reservation to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania in its note to the Secretary-General of 5 June 2001.

The Government of Austria considers that, in the absence of further clarification, this reservation raises doubts as to the degree of commitment assumed by Mauritania in becoming a party to the Convention since it refers to the contents of Islamic Sharia and to existing national legislation in Mauritania. The Government of Austria would like to recall that, according to art. 28 (2) of the Convention as well as customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

For these reasons, the Government of Austria objects to this reservation made by the Government of Mauritania.

This position, however, does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Convention between Mauritania and Austria."

31 March 2003

With regard to the reservation made by Bahrain upon accession:

"The Government of Austria has examined the reservation to the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain in its note to the Secretary-General of 18 June 2002, regarding articles 2, 9(2), 15(4) and 16.

The reservation to articles 9(2) and 15(4), if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex. This is contrary to the objct and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Austria further considers that, in the absence of further clarification, the reservation to articles 2 and 16 which does not clearly specify the extent of Bahrain's derogation from the provisions in question raises doubts as to the degree of commitment assumed by Bahrain in becoming a party to the Convention since it refers to the contents of Islamic Sharia.

The Government of Austria would like to recall that, according to art. 28(2) of the Convention as well as customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

For these reasons, the Government of Austria objects to this reservation made by the Government of Bahrain.

This position, however, does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Convention between Bahrain and Austria."

14 August 2003

With regard to the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of Austria has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women regarding article 2, article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, article 16, paragraphs 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g) and article 16, paragraph 2.

The Government of Austria finds that the reservations to article 2, article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, article 16, paragraphs 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex. This is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Austria further considers that, in the absence of further clarification, the reservation to article 16, paragraph 2, which refers to the contents of Islamic Sharia, does not clearly specify the extent of the reservation and therefore raises doubts as to the degree of commitment assumed by the Syrian Arab Republic in becoming a party to the Convention.

The Government of Austria would like to recall that, according to article 28 (2) of the Convention as well as customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

For these reasons, the Government of Austria objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This position, however, does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Convention between the Syrian Arab Republic and Austria."

5 October 2005

With regard to the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates upon accession:

"The Government of Austria has examined the reservation made by the Government of the United Arab Emirates upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women regarding articles 2 (f), 9, 15 (2), 16 and 29 (1).

The Government of Austria finds that the reservations to article 2 (f), article 9, article 15 (2) and article 16, if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex. This is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Astria would like to recall that, according to article 28 (2) of the Convention as well as customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

For these reasons, the Government of Austria objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the United Arab Emirates to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This position, however, does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Convention between the United Arab Emirates and Austria."

18 December 2006

With regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

"The Government of Austria has examined the reservations made by the Government of Brunei Darussalam upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

The Government of Austria finds that the reservation to article 9, paragraph 2 would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex. This is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Austria further considers that, in the absence of further clarification, the reservation "regarding those provisions of the said Convention that may be contrary to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islam" does not clearly specify its extent and therefore raises doubts as to the degree of commitment assumed by Brunei Darussalam in becoming a party to the Convention.

The Government of Austria would like to recall that, according to article 28, paragraph 2 of the Convention as well as customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

For these reasons, the Government of Austria objects to the aforementioned reservations made by Brunei Darussalam to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This position however does not preclude the entry into force in its enirety of the Convention between Brunei Darussalam and Austria."

5 January 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

"The Government of Austria has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

The Government of Austria finds that the reservations to article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, and article 16 would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex. This is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Austria further considers that, in the absence of further clarification, the reservation to "all provisions of the Convention not in accordance with the provisions of the Islamic sharia and legislation in force in the Sultanate of Oman" does not clearly specify its extent and therefore raises doubts as to the degree of commitment assumed by the Sultanate of Oman in becoming a party to the Convention.

The Government of Austria would like to recall that, according to article 28, paragraph 2 of the Convention as well as customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (Art. 19 subparagraph c), a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are requested as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

For these reasons, the Government of Austria objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This position however does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Convention between the Sultanate of Oman and Austria."

CANADA

25 October 1994

With regard to the reservations made by Maldives upon accession:

"In the view of the Government of Canada, this reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2). The Government of Canada therefore enters its formal objection to this reservation. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between Canada and the Republic of Maldives."

14 June 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

"Canada has carefully examined the reservation formulated by Brunei Darussalam when it acceded, on 24 May 2006, to the Convention on the Elimination of Al Forms of Discrimination against Women, adopted in New York on 18 December 1979.

Canada notes that the reservation formulated with respect to article 9, paragraph 2, concerns a fundamental provision of the Convention and is therefore incompatible with the object and purpose of that instrument.

In addition, the reservation makes the implementation of the Convention's provisions contingent upon their compatibility with the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and the beliefs and principles of Islam, the official religion of Brunei Darussalam. The Government of Canada notes that such general reservation of unlimited scope and undefined character does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which Brunei Darussalam has accepted the obligations of the Convention and creates serious doubts as to the commitment of the State to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. Accordingly, the Government of Canada considers this reservation to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

Canada recalls that, under article 28, paragraph 2, of the Convention, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention are not permitted.

Under customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty is not permitted.

In consequence, Canada objects to the reservation formulated by Brunei Darussalam with respect to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Canada and Brunei Darussalam. The Convention shall enter into force in its entirety, without Brunei Darussalam benefiting from its reservation."

CZECH REPUBLIC

12 January 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

"The Government of the Czech Republic has examined the reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

The Government of the Czech Republic is of the view that the reservations made to Article 9 paragraph 2, Article 15, paragraph 4 and Article 16, if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. Furthermore, the Government of the Czech Republic notes that the reservation regarding all provisions of the Convention not in accordance with the provisions of the Islamic sharia and legislation in force in the Sultanate of Oman does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the Sultanate of Oman has accepted the obligations of the Convention and therefore raises concerns as to its commitment to the object and purpose of the Convention.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to Article 28, paragraph 2 of the Convention and according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Czech Republic therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman to the Convention. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Czech Republic and the Sultanate of Oman. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the Czech Republic and the Sultanate of Oman, without the Sultanate of Oman benefiting from its reservation."

11 April 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

"The Government of the Czech Republic has examined the reservations made by the Government of Brunei Darussalam upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women regarding Article 9 paragraph 2 and those provisions of the Convention that may be contrary to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islam.

The Government of the Czech Republic notes that a reservation to a Convention which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. Furthermore, the reservation made to Article 9 paragraph 2, if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to Article 28 paragraph 2 of the Convention and according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Czech Republic therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Brunei Darussalam to the Convention. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Czech Republic and Brunei Darussalam. The Convention enters into force inits entirety between the Czech Republic and Brunei Darussalam, without Brunei Darussalam benefiting from its reservation."

DENMARK

3 July 1990

With regard to the reservation made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya upon accession:

"The Government of Denmark has taken note of the reservation made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya when acceding [to the said Convention]. In the view of the Government of Denmark this reservation is subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform a treaty."

2 November 2000

With regard to the reservations to article 2, paragraphs (d) and (f), article 5, paragraph (a), article 15, paragraph (4) and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (e) and (g) made by Niger upon accession:

"The Government of Denmark finds that the reservations made by the Government of Niger are not in conformity with the object and purpose of the Convention. The provisions in respect of which Niger has made reservations cover fundamental rights of women and establish key elements for the elimination of discrimination against women. For this reason, the Government of Denmark objects to the said reservations made by the Government of Niger.

The Convention remains in force in its entirety between Niger and Denmark.

It is the opinion of the Government of Denmark, that no time limit applies to objections against reservations, which are inadmissible under international law.

The Government of Denmark recommends the Government of Niger to reconsider its reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women."

10 August 2001

With regard to the reservations made by Saudi Arabia upon ratification:

"The Government of Denmark has examined the reservations made by the Government of Saudi Arabia upon ratification on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women as to any interpretation of the provisions of the Convention that is incompatibleith the norms of Islamic law.

The Government of Denmark finds that the general reservation with reference to the provisions of Islamic law are of unlimited scope and undefined character. Consequently, the Government of Denmark considers the said reservations as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and accordingly inadmissible and without effect under international law.

The Government of Denmark furthermore notes that the reservation to paragraph 2 of article 9 of the Convention aims to exclude one obligation of non-discrimination which is the aim of the Convention and therefore renders this reservation contrary to the essence of the Convention.

The Government of Denmark therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

These objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention in its entirety between Saudi Arabia and Denmark.

The Government of Denmark recommends the Government of Saudi Arabia to reconsider its reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women."

21 February 2002

With regard to the reservation made by Mauritania upon accession:

"The Government of Denmark has examined the reservations made by the Government of Mauritania upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women as to any interpretation of the provisions of the Convention that is incompatiblewith the norms of Islamic law and the Constitution in Mauritania.

The Government of Denmark finds that the general reservation with reference to the provisions of Islamic law and the Constitution are of unlimited scope and undefined character. Consequently, the Government of Denmark considers the said reservation as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and accordingly inadmissible andwithout effect under international law.

The Government of Denmark therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Mauritania to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention in its entirety between Mauritania and Denmark.

The Government of Denmark recommends the Government of Mauritania to reconsider its reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women."

With regard to the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon accession:

"The Government of Denmark has examined the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon accession to the Convention on [the] Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women in respect of paragraph (f) of article 2 and paragraph 2 of article 9.

The Government of Denmark finds that the reservation to paragraph (f) of article 2 aims at excluding the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from the obligation to adopt necessary measures, including those of a legislative character, to eliminate any form of discrimination against women. This provision touches upon a key element for effective elimination of discrimination against women.

The Government of Denmark furthermore notes that the reservation toparagraph 2 of article 9 of the

Convention aims to exclude an obligation of non-discrimination, which is the aim of the Convention.

The Government of Denmark finds that the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea are not in conformity with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Denmark therefore objects to the said reservation made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

The Government of Denmark recommends the Government of [the] Democratic People's Republic of Korea to reconsider its reservations to the Convention.

The Convention on [the] Elimination of All Forms Discrimination Against Women remains in force in its entirety between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Denmark."

28 February 2003

With regard to the reservation made by Bahrain upon accession:

"The Government of Denmark has examined the reservations made by the Government of Bahrain upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women regarding article 2, paragraph 2 of article 9, paragraph 4 of article 15 and article 16.

The Government of Denmark finds that the reservation to articles 2 and 16 with reference to the provisions of Islamic Sharia is of unlimited scope and undefined character. Consequently, the Government of Denmark considers the said reservations as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and accordingly inadmissible and without effect under international law.

The Government of Denmark furthermore notes that the reservations to paragraph 2 of article 9 and to paragraph 4 of article 15 of the Convention seek to exclude an obligation of non-discrimination, which is the aim of the Convention. The Government of Denmark finds that these reservations made by the Government of Bahrain are not in conformity with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Denmark therefore objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the Government of Bahrain to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women. This shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention in its entirety between Bahrain and Denmark.

The Government of Denmark recommends the Government of Bahrain to reconsider its reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women."

27 May 2003

With regard to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of Denmark has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women regarding article 2, article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, article 16, paragraphs 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g) and article 16, paragraph 2 in its note of 7 April 2003, to the Secretary-General of the United Nations distributed under reference No. C.N.267.2003.TREATIES-6.

The Government of Denmark finds that the reservation to article 2 seeks to evade the obligation of non-discrimination, which is the aim of the Convention. The Government of Denmark is of the view that a general reservation to one of the core articles of the Convention raises doubts as to the commitment of the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to fulfil its obligations under the Convention.

The Government of Denmark furthermore notes that the reservations to article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, article 16, paragraphs 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g) and article 16, paragraph 2, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. It should be borne in mind that the principles of equal rights of men and women and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations as one of the purposes of the organization, as well as in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

The Government of Denmark finds that these reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic are not in conformity with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Denmark recalls that according to article 28, paragraph 2 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Denmark therefore objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

This shall not prelude the entry into force of the Convention in its entirety between the Syrian Arab Republic and Denmark.

The Government of Denmark recommends the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to reconsider its reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women."

6 October 2006

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

"The Government of Denmark has examined the reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women regarding article 9 (2), 15 (4), 16 (a, c, f), and all provisions of the Convention not in accordance with the principles of the Islamic Sharia.

The Government of Denmark finds that the general reservation with reference to the provisions of the Islamic Sharia is of unlimited scope and undefined character. The Government of Denmark furthermore notes that the reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman to article 9 (2), 15 (4), and 16 (a, c, f) would inevitable result in the discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. Consequently, the Government of Denmark considers the said reservations to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and accordingly inadmissible and without effect under international law.

The Government of Denmark wishes to recall that, according to article 28 (2) of the Convention, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Denmark therefore objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women. This shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention in its entirety between Oman and Denmark.

The Government of Denmark recommends the Sultanate of Oman to reconsider its reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women."

With regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

"The Government of Denmark has examined the reservations made by the Government of Brunei Darussalam upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women regarding article 9 (2) and all provisions of the Convention not in accordance with the principles of Islam.

The Government of Denmark finds that the general reservation made by the Government of Brunei

Darussalam with reference to the principles of Islam is of unlimited scope and undefined character. The Government of Denmark furthermore notes that the reservation to article 9 (2) would inevitably result in the discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. Consequently, the Government of Denmark considers the said reservations to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and accordingly inadmissible and without effect under international law.

The Government of Denmark wishes to recall that, according to article 28 (2) of the Convention, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Denmark therefore objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the Government of Brunei Darussalam to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women. This shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention in its entirety between Brunei Darussalam and Denmark.

The Government of Denmark recommends the Government of Brunei Darussalam to reconsider its reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women."

ESTONIA

1 April 2004

With regard to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of Estonia has carefully examined the reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to Article 2, paragraph 2 of Article 9, paragraph 4 of Article 15 and to paragraphs 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g) of Article 16 of the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

Article 2 of the Convention is one of the core articles of the Convention. By making a reservation to this article, the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic is making a reservation of general scope that renders the provisions of the Convention completely ineffective. The Government of Estonia considers the reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The reservations to article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4 and article 16, paragraphs 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. It should be borne in mind that the principles of equal rights of men and women and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations as one of the purposes of the organization, as well as in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

The reservation to article 16, paragraph 2, makes a general reference to the Islamic Shariah. The Government of Estonia is of the view that in the absence of further clarification, this reservation which does not clearly specify the extent of the Syrian Arab Republic's derogation from the provision in question raises serious doubts as to the commitment of the Syrian Arab Republic to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Estonia recalls that according to article 28, paragraph 2 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shal not be permitted.

The Government of Estonia therefore objects to the afore-mentioned reservation made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Syrian Arab Republic and Estonia. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without the Syrian Arab Republic benefiting from its reservations.

The Government of Estonia recommends the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to reconsider its reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women."

4 December 2006

With regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

"The Government of the Republic of Estonia has carefully examined the reservations made by the Government of Brunei Darussalam to Article 9, paragraph 2 of the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

The reservation to Article 9, paragraph 2, if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention.

Furthermore, the reservation made by Brunei Darussalam makes a general reference to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islam. The Government of Estonia is of the view that in the absence of further clarification, the reservation makes it unclear to what extent the State of Brunei Darussalam considers itself bound by the obligations of the Convention and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the State of Brunei Darussalam to the object and purpose of the Convention.

According to Article 28, paragraph 2 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Estonia therefore objects to the reservation to Article 9, paragraph 2, and to the general reservation regarding the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islam, made by the Government of Brunei Darussalam to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women as between the Republic of Estonia and the State of Brunei Darussalam."

With regard to the reservation made by Oman upon accession:

"The Government of the Republic of Estonia has carefully examined the reservations made by the Government of Sultanate of Oman to paragraph 2 of Article 9, paragraph 4 of Article 15, and subparagraphs (a), (c) and (f) of Article 16 of the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

The reservations to paragraph 2 of Article 9, paragraph 4 of Article 15, and subparagraphs (a), (c) and (f) of Article 16, if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. In particular, Article 16 is one of the core provisions of the Convention to which reservations are incompatible with the Convention and therefore impermissible.

Furthermore, section one of the reservation makes a general reference to the provisions of the Islamic sharia and legislation in force in the Sultanate of Oman. The Government of Estonia is of the view that in the absence of further clarification, this reservation makes it unclear to what extent the Sultanate of Oman considers itself bound by the obligations of the Convention and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the Sultanate of Oman to the object and purpose of the Convention.

According to Article 28, paragraph 2 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Estonia therefore objects to the general reservation made in section one, and reservations to paragraph 2 of Article 9, paragraph 4 of Article 15, and subparagraphs (a), (c) and (f) of Article 16, made by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women as between the Republic of Estonia and the Sultanate of Oman".

FINLAND

8 June 1990

With regard to the reservation made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya upon accession (see also objection made on 16 October 1996, hereinafter, with regard to the reservation made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya upon accession, as modified on 5 July 1995):

"The Government of Finland has examined the contents of the reservation made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and considers the said reservation as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of Finland therefore enters its formal objection to this reservation.

"This objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between Finland and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya."

5 May 1994

With regard to the reservations made by Maldives upon accession:

In the view of the Government of Finland, the unlimited and undefined character of the said reservations create serious doubts about the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. In their extensive formulation, they are clearly contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. Therefore, the Government of Finland objects to such reservations.

The Government of Finland also recalls that the said reservations are subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as a justification for failure to perform its treaty obligations.

The Government of Finland does not, however, consider that this objection constitutes an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Finland and Maldives."

17 January 1996

With regard to the reservations made by Kuwait upon accession:

"The Government of Finland recalls that by acceding to the Convention, a State commits itself to adopt the measures required for the elimination of discrimination, in all its forms and manifestations, against women. In particular, aricle 7 requires States Parties to undertake actions to eliminate discrimination against women in the political and public life of the country. This is a fundamental provision of the Convention the implementation of which is essential to fulfilling its object and purpose.

Reservations to article 7 (a) and article 9 paragraph 2 are both subject to the general principle of the observance of treaties according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform its treaty obligations. It is in the common interest of States that contracting parties to international treaties are prepared to undertake the necessary legislative changes in order to fulfill the object and purpose of the treaty.

Furthermore, in the view of the Government of Finland, the unlimited and undefined character of the reservation to article 16 (f) leaves open to what extent the reserving State commits itself to the Convention and therefore creates serious doubts about the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. Reservations of such unspecified nature may contribute to undermining the basis of international human rights treaties.

In their present formulation the reservations are clearly incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and therefore inadmissible under article 28 paragraph 2, of the said Convention. Therefore, the Government of Finland objects to these reservations. The Government of Finland further notes that the reservations made by the Government of Kuwait are devoid of legal effect.

The Government of Finland recommends the Government of Kuwait to reconsider its reservations to the [said] Convention."

16 October 1996

With regard to the reservation made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya upon accession, as modified (see objection under 8 June 1990 and note 28):

"A reservation which consists of a general reference to religious law without specifying i contents does not clearly define to the other Parties of the Convention the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Convention and therefore may cast doubts about the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. Such a reservation is also, in the view of the Government of Finland, subject to the general principle of the observance of treaties according to which a Party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform a treaty."

With regard to the reservations made by Malaysia upon accession:

"The reservations made by Malaysia, consisting of a general reference to religious and national law without specifying the contents thereof and without stating unequivocally the provisions the legal effect of which may be excluded or modified, do not clearly define to the other Parties of the Convention the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Convention and therefore creates serious doubts about the commitment of the reserving State to fulfill its obligations under the Convention. Reservations of such unspecified nature may contribute to undermining the basis of international human rights treaties.

The Government of Finland also recalls that the reservations of Malaysia are subject to the general principles of observance of treaties according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform its treaty obligations. It is in the common interest of States that Parties to international treaties are prepared to take the necessary legislative changes in order to fulfil the object and purpose of the treaty.

Furthermore, the reservations made by Malaysia, in particular to articles 2 (f) and 5 (a), are two fundamental provisions of the Convention the implementation of which is essential to fulfilling its object and purpose.

The Government of Finland considers that in their present formulation the reservations made by Malaysia are clearly incompatible with the object and purpose of the said Convention and therefore inadmissible under article 28, paragraph 2, of the said Convention. In view of the above, the Government of Finland objects to these reservations and notes that they are devoid of legal effect."

1 November 1996

With regard to the reservations made by Lesotho upon ratification:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made for Malaysia.]

21 November 1996

With regard to the reservations made by Singapore upon accession:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made for Malaysia .]

6 June 1997

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made for Malaysia.]

24 October 2000

With regard to the reservations made by Niger upon accession:

" The Government of Finland notes that the reservations [..] are not in conformity with the object and purpose of the Convention. By acceding to the Convention, a State commits itself to adopt the measures required for the elimination of discrimination against women, in all its forms and manifestations. This includes taking appropriate measures, including legislation, to modify or abolish i.e. customs and practices which constitute discrimination against women.

As it appears evident that the Government of the Republic of Niger will not apply the Convention with a view to fulfilling its treaty obligations to eliminate all forms of discrimination against women and submits reservations to some of the most essential provisions of the Convention, the above-mentioned reservations are in contradiction with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Finland recalls Part VI, Article 28 of the Convention according to which reservations incompible with object and purpose of the Convention are not permitted.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations made by the Government of Niger to the Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Niger and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two states without benefitting from the reservations."

8 October 2002

With regard to the reservations made by Saudi Arabia upon ratification:

"The Government of Finland has examined the contents of the reservations made by the Government of Saudi Arabia to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

The Government of Finland recalls that by acceding to the Convention, a State commits itself to adopt the measures required for the elimination of discrimination, in all its forms and manifestations, against women.

A reservation which consists of a general reference to religious law and national law without specifying its contents, as the first part of the reservation made by Saudi Arabia, does not clearly define to other Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Convention and therefore creates serious doubts as to the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the Convention.

Furthermore, reservations are subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

As the reservation to Paragraph 2 of Article 9 aims to exclude one of the fundamental obligations under the Convention, it is the view of the Government of Finland that the reservation is not compatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Finland also recalls Part VI, Article 28 of the Convention according to which reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention are not permitted.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations made by the Government of Saudi Arabia to the Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Saudi Arabia and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without Saudi Arabia benefiting from the reservations."

5 March 2002

With regard to the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon accession:

"The Government of Finland has carefully examined the contents of the reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

The Government of Finland recalls that by acceding to the Convention, a State commit itself to adopt the measures required for the elimination of discrimination, in all its forms and manifestations, against women.

The Government of Finland notes that the reservation to paragraph (f) of Article 2 aims at excluding the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from the obligations to adopt necessary measures, including those of a legislative character, to eliminate any form of discrimination against women. This provision touches upon a key element for effective elimination of discrimination against women.

The Government of Finland further notes that the reservation to paragraph 2 of Article 9 of the Convention aims to exclude an obligation of non-discrimination, which is the aim of the Convention.

The Government of Finland also recalls Part VI, Article 28 of the Convention according to which reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention are not permitted.

The Government of Finland finds that the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea are not in conformity with the object and purpose of the Convention and therefore objects to the said reservations.

This oection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the People's Democratic Republic of Korea and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States with the People's Democratic Republic of Korea benefiting from the reservations."

20 May 2002

With regard to the reservation made by Mauritania upon accession:

"The Government of Finland has carefully examined the contents of the reservation made by the Government of Mauritania to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

The Government of Finland notes that a reservation which consists of a general reference to religious or other national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define to other Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Convention and therefore creates serious doubts as to the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the Convention.

Furthermore, reservations are subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

The Government of Finland recalls Part VI, Article 28 of the Convention according to which reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention are not permitted.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservation made by the Government of Mauritania to the Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Mauritania and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two states without Mauritania benefiting from the reservations."

10 March 2003

With regard to the reservations made by Bahrain upon accession:

"The Government of Finland has carefully examined the contents of the reservations made by the Government of Bahrain to Article 2, paragraph 2 of Article 9, paragraph 4 of Article 15 and to Article 16 of the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

The Government of Finland notes that a reservation which consists of a general reference to religious or other national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define to other Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Convention and therefore creates serious doubts as to the commitment of the receiving State to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. Such reservations are subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

The Government of Finland further notes that the reservations made by Bahrain, addressing some of the most essential provisions of the Convention, and aiming to exclude some of the fundamental obligations under it, are in contradiction with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Finland also recalls Part VI, Article 28 of the Convention according to which reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention are not permitted.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations made by the Government of Bahrain to the Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Bahrain and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two states without Bahrain benefiting from its reservations."

17 June 2003

With regard to the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of Finland has carefully examined the contents of the reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to Article 2, paragraph 2 of Article 9, paragraph 4 of Article 15 and to paragraphs 1(c), (d), (f) and (g) of Article 16 of the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

The Government of Finland notes that a reservation which consists of a general reference to religious or other national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define for other Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Convention and therefore creates serious doubts as to the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. Such reservations are subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

The Government of Finland further notes that the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic, addressing some of the most essential provisions of the Convention, and aiming to exclude some of the fundamental obligations under it, are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Finland also recalls Part VI, Article 28, of the Convention, according to which reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention are not permitted.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the afore-mentioned reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Syrian Arab Republic and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two states without the Syrian Arab Republic benefiting from its reservations."

7 September 2005

With regard to the reservations made by Micronesia (Federated States of) upon accession:

"The Government of Finland has carefully examined the contents of the reservations made by the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia to paragraph (f) of Article 2, Article 5, paragraphs 1 (d) and 2 (b) of Article 11 and Article 16 othe Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

The Government of Finland recalls that by acceding to the Convention, a State commit itself to adopt the measures required for the elimination of discrimination, in all its forms and manifestations, against women.

The Government of Finland notes that the reservations made by Micronesia, addressing some of the most essential provisions of the Convention, and aiming to exclude the obligations under those provisions, are in contradiction with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Finland also recalls Part VI, Article 28 of the Convention according to which reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention are not permitted.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the ab0ve-mentioned reservations made by the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia to the Convention. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Micronesia and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two states without Micronesia benefiting from its reservations".

15 November 2005

With regard to the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates upon accession:

"The Government of Finland has carefully examined the contents of the reservations made by the Government of the United Arab Emirates to paragraph (f) of Article 2, Article 9, paragraph (2) of Article 15 and Article 16 of the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women,

The Government of Finland recalls that by acceding to the Convention, a State commits itself to adopt the measures required for the elimination of discrimination, in all its forms and manifestations, against women.

The Government of Finland notes that a reservation which consists of a general reference to religious or other national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define to other Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Convention and creates serious doubts as to the commitment of the receiving State to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. Such reservations are, furthermore, subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

The Government of Finland notes that the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates, addressing some of the most essential provisions of the Convention, and aiming to exclude the obligations under those provisions, are in contradiction with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Finland also recalls Part VI, Article 28 of the Convention according to which reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention are not permitted.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations made by the Government of the United Arab Emirates to the Convention. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Arab Emirates and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two states without the United Arab Emirates benefiting from its reservations."

27 February 2007

With regard to the reservations made Oman upon accession:

The Government of Finland has carefully examined the contents of the general reservation made by the Government of Oman to all provisions of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the specific reservations concerning paragraph 2 of Article 9, paragraph 4 of Article 15 and paragraphs 1 (a), 1 (c) and 1 (f) of Article 16 of the Convention.

The Government of Finland recalls that by acceding to the Convention, a State commits itself to adopt the measures required for the elimination of discrimination, in all its forms and manifestations, against women.

The Government of Finland notes that a reservation which consists of a general reference to religious or other national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define to other Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Convention and creates serious doubts as to the commitment of the receiving State to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. Such reservations are, furthermore, subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

The Government of Finland also notes that the specific reservations made by Oman, addressing some of the most essential provisions of the Convention, and aiming to exclude the obligations under those provisions, are in contradiction with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Finland also recalls Part VI, Article 28 of the Convention, according to which reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention are not permitted.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations made by the Government of Oman to the Convention. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Oman and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without Oman benefiting from its reservations.

With regard to the reservations made Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

The Government of Finland has carefully examined the contents of the general reservation made by the Government of Brunei Darussalam to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the specific reservation concerning paragraph 2 of Article 9 of the Convention.

The Government of Finland recalls that by acceding to the Convention, a State commits itself to adopt the measures required for the elimination of discrimination, in all its forms and manifestations, against women.

The Government of Finland notes that a reservation which consists of a general reference to religious or other national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define to other Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Convention and creates serious doubts as to the commitment of the receiving State to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. Such reservations are, furthermore, subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

The Government of Finland also notes that the specific reservation made by Brunei Darussalam concerning paragraph 2 of Article 9 aims to exclude one of the fundamental obligations under the Convention and is therefore in contradiction with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Finland also recalls Part VI, Article 28 of the Convention, according to which reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention are not permitted.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations made by the Government of Brunei Darussalam to the Convention. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Brunei Darussalam and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without Brunei Darussalam benefiting from its reservations.

FRANCE

26 June 2001

With regard to reservations made by Saudi Arabia upon ratification:

The Government of the French Republic has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, adopted in New York on 18 December 1979. By stating that in case of contradiction between any term of the Convention and the norms of Islamic law, it is not under obligation to observe the terms of the Convention, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia formulates a reservation of general, indeterminate scope that gives the other States parties absolutely no idea which provisions of the Convention are affected or might be affected in future. The Government of the French Republic believes that the reservation could make the provisions of the Convention completely ineffective and therefore objects to it. The second reservation, concerning article 9, paragraph 2, rules out equality of rights between men and women with respect to the nationality of their children and the Government of the French Republic therefore objects to it.

These objections do not preclude the Convention's entry into force between Saudi Arabia and France. The reservation rejecting the means of dispute settlement provided for in article 29, paragraph 1, of the Convention is in conformity with the provisions of article 29, paragraph 2.

4 March 2002

With regard to reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon accession:

Having considered the reservations and declarations made on 27 February 2001 by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women of 18 December 1979, the Government of the French Republic objects to the said reservations and declarations relating to article 2, paragraph (f) and article 9, paragraph 2.

25 April 2003

With regard to reservas made by Bahrain upon accession:

The Government of the Republic of France has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women of 18 December 1979. The Government of the Republic of France considers that, by making the implementation of articles 2 and 16 of the Convention subject to respect for the Islamic Shariah, the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain is making two reservations of such a general and indeterminate scope that it is not possible to ascertain which changes to obligations under the Convention they are intended to introduce.

Consequently, the Government of France considers that the reservations as formulated could make the provisions of the Convention completely ineffective. For these reasons, the Government objects to the reservations made in respect of articles 2 and 16 of the Convention, which it considers to be reservations likely to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of France objects to the reservations made in respect of article 9, paragraph 2, and article 15, paragraph 4, of the Convention.

The Government of France notes that these objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women between Bahrain and France.

21 July 2003

With regard to reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

[The Government of the French Republic has examined the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon its accession to the 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

The Government of the French Republic considers that, by making a reservation to article 2 of the Convention, the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic is making a reservation of general scope that renders the provisions of the Convention completely ineffective.For this reason, the French Government objects to the reservation, which it considers to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The French Government objects to the reservations made to article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, and article 16, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Convention. The French Government notes that these objections do not preclude the entry into force of the 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women between Syria and France.

18 November 2005

With regard to the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates upon accession:

The Government of the French Republic has examined the reservations formulated by the United Arab Emirates upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, of 18 December 1979, according to which the United Arab Emirates, on the one hand, does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 2 (f) and article 15, paragraph 2, because they are contrary to the sharia and, on the other, states that it will abide by the provisions of article 16 insofar as they are not in conflict with the principles of the sharia. The Government of the French Republic considers that, by precluding the application of these provisions, or by making it subject to the principles of the sharia, the United Arab Emirates is formulating reservations with a general scope depriving the provisions of the Convention of any effect. The Government of the French Republic considers that these reservations are contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention and enters an objection thereto. The Government of the French Republic also objects to the reservation formulated to article 9. These objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between France and the United Arab Emirates.

13 February 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

The Government of the French Republic has considered the reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women of 18 December 1979, according to which the Sultanate of Oman does not consider itself bound by 'any provisions of the Convention which are incompatible with Islamic Sharia or with the laws in force in the Sultanate of Oman', or by the provisions of article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4 and article 16, in particular paragraph 1 (a), (c) and (f). The Government of the French Republic considers that, by ruling out the application of the Convention or subordinating it to Sharia principles and the laws in force, the Sultanate of Oman is making a reservation of a general and indeterminate nature, thereby depriving the provisions of the Convention of any effect. The Government of the French Republic considers this reservation to be contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention and therefore wishes to register an objection thereto. The Government of the French Republic also objects to the reservations made to article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4 and article 16, in particular paragraph 1 (a), (c) and (f). These objections shall not prevent the entry into force of the Convention between France and the Sultanate of Oman.

13 June 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

The Government of the French Republic has examined the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam upon acceding to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, of 18 December 1979. The Government of the French Republic believes that in 'expressing' reservations regarding provisions of the Convention 'that may be contrary to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islam', Brunei Darussalam is making a reservation of broad and indeterminate scope which does not allowhe other States Parties to ascertain which provisions of the Convention are envisaged and which may render the provisions of the Convention null and void. The Government of the French Republic believes that this reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and objects to it. The Government of the French Republic also objects to the reservation made specifically to article 9, paragraph 2 of the Convention. These objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between France and Brunei Darussalam.

GERMANY[22]

The Federal Republic of Germany considers that the reservations made by Egypt regarding article 2, article 9, paragraph 2, and article 16, by Bangladesh regarding article 2, article 13 (a) and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), and (f), by Brazil regarding article 15, paragraph 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (a), (c), (g) and (h), by Jamaica regarding article 9, paragraph 2, by the Republic of Korea regarding article 9 and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), and by Mauritius regarding article 11, paragraph 1 (b) and (d), and article 16, paragraph 1 (g), are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2) and therefore objects to them. In relation to the Federal Republic of Germany, they may not be invoked in support of a legal practice which does not pay due regard to the legal status afforded to women and children in the Federal Republic of Germany in conformity with the above-mentioned articles of the Convention. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between Egypt, Bangladesh, Brazil, Jamaica, the Republic of Korea, Mauritius and the Federal Republic of Germany.

Objections of the same nature were also formulated by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany in regard to reservations made by various states, as follows:

i) 15 October 1986: In respect of reservations formulated by the Government of Thailand concerning article 9, paragraph 2, article 10, article 11, paragraph 1 (b), article 15, paragraph 3 and article 16; (The Federal Republic of Germany also holds the view that the reservation made by Thailand regarding article 7 of the Convention is likewise incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention because for all matters which concern national security it reserves in a general and thus unspecific manner the right of the Royal Thai Government to apply the provisions only within the limits established by national laws, regulations and practices).

ii)15 October 1986: In respect of reservations and some declarations formulated by the Government of Tunisia concerning article 9, paragraph 2 and article 16, as well as the declaration concerning article 15, paragraph 4.

iii) 3 March 1987: In respect of reservations made by the Government of Turkey to article 15, paragraphs 2 and 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g); in respect of reservations made by the Government of Iraq with regard to article 2, paragraphs (f) and (g), article 9 and article 16.

iv) 7 April 1988: In respect of the first reservation made by Malawi.

v) 20 June 1990: In respect of the reservation made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

vi) 24 October 1994: In respect of the reservations made by Maldives.

vii) 8 October 1996: In respect of the reservations made by Malaysia.

viii) 28 May 1997: In respect of the declaration made by Pakistan.

ix) 19 June 1997: In respect of the reservation made by Algeria.

19 January 2001

With regard to the reservations made by Saudi Arabia upon ratification:

“The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the view that the reservation, with regard to compatibility of CEDAW rules with Islamic law, raises doubts as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to CEDAW. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers this reservation to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany notes furthermore that the reservation to Paragraph 2 of article 9 of CEDAW aims to exclude one obligation of non-discrimination which is so important in the context of CEDAW as to render this reservation contrary to the essence of the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the Convention on Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection does not preclude t entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia."

2 October 2001

With regard to the reservations made by the Decmocatic People’s Republic of Korea upon accession:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has examined the reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon its accession to the Convention. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the view that the reservations to article 2 paragraph (f) and article 9 paragraph 2 of CEDAW are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, for they aim at excluding the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's obligations in respect of two basic aspects of the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the Convention on all Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea."

14 March 2002

With regard to the reservation made by Mauritania upon accession:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has examined the reservation to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women made by the Government of Mauritania at the time of its accession to the Convention. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the view that the reservation with regard to the compatibility of the rules of the Convention with the precepts of Islamic Sharia and the Constitution of Mauritania raises doubts as to the commitment of Mauritania to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany consers this reservation to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. Therefore the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Mauritania to the Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and Mauritania."

18 February 2003

With regard to the reservations made by Bahrain upon accession:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has examined the reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain at the time of accession to the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the view that the reservations with regard to the compatibility of the rules of articles 2 and 16 of the Convention with the precepts of Islamic Shariah raises doubts as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Bahrain to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. These reservations are therefore incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The reservations to article 9 paragraph 2 and article 15 paragraph 4, if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

According to article 28 paragraph 2 of the Convention reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

Therefore, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Kingdom of Bahrain."

25 August 2003

With regard to the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women in respect of Article 2; Article 9, paragraph 2; Article 15, paragraph 4; Article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g); and Article 16, paragraph 2.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany finds that the aforesaid reservations would allow to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State with regard to essential provisions of the Convention and therefore raise doubts as to the commitment assumed by this State in acceding to the Convention.

Consequently, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers that these reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

According to Article 28, paragraph 2 of the Convention reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Syrian Arab Republic."

9 November 2005

With regard to the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates upon accession:

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the reservations made by the Government of the United Arab Emirates upon accession to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. It is of the opinion that from the reservations to Article 2 (f), Article 15 (2) and Article 16, which give a specific legal system, the Islamic Sharia, precedence as a rule over the provisions of the Convention, it is unclear to what extent the UAE feels bound by the obligations of the Convention.

Moreover, the reservations to Article 9 (2) and Article 15 (2) would in practice result in a legal situation that discriminated against women, which would not be compatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Pursuant to Article 28 (2) of the Convention, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of the present Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations made by the Government of the United Arab Emirates to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Arab Emirates.

28 August 2006

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman on 7 February 2006 upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women of 18 December 1979. The reservations state the Sultanate of Oman does not consider itself bound by provisions of the Convention that are not in accordance with the provisions of the Islamic Sharia and legislation in force in the Sultanate of Oman, and also state that it is not bound by Article 9 (2), Article 15 (4) and Article 16, subparagraphs (a), (c) and (f) of the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that by giving precedence to the principles of the Sharia and its own national law over the application of the provisions of the Convention, the Sultanate of Oman has made a reservation which leaves it unclear to what extent it feels bound by the obligations of the Convention and which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. Furthermore, the reservations to Article 9 (2), Article 15 (4) and Article16 will unavoidably result in a legal situation that discriminates against women, which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Pursuant to Article 28 (2) of the Convention, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Sultanate of Oman."

19 December 2006

With regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam on 24 May 2006 upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women of 18 December 1979. The reservations state that Brunei Darussalam does not consider itself bound by provisions of the Convention that are contrary to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islam, in particular Article 9 (2) of the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that by giving precedence to the beliefs and principles of Islam and its own constitutional law over the application of the provisions of the Convention, Brunei Darussalam has made a reservation which leaves it unclear to what extent it feels bound by the obligations of the Convention and which incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. Furthermore, the reservation to Article 9 (2) will unavoidably result in a legal situation that discriminates against women, which is incompatibe with the object and purpose of the Convention,

Pursuant to Article 28 (2) of the Convention, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and Brunei Darussalam."

GREECE

13 June 2003

With regard to reservations made by Bahrain upon accession:

"The Government of the Hellenic Republic has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic considers that the reservations with respect to articles 2 and 16, which contain a reference to the provisions of the Islamic Sharia are of unlimited scope and, therefore, incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic recalls that, according to article 28 (para 2) of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic therefore objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women. This shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention in its entirety between Bahrain and Greece."

4 March 2004

With regard to the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of the Hellenic Republic has examined the reservations made by the Government of the

Syrian Arab Republic upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic is of the view that the reservation with respect to article 2, which is a core provision of the Convention, is of a general character and is, therefore, contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention.

It also considers that the reservation regarding article 16, paragraph 2 which contains a reference to the provisions of the Islamic Shariah is of unlimited scope and is, similarly, incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic recalls that according to article 28 paragraph 2 of the Convention, a reservation which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

Consequently, the Government of the Hellenic Republic objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. This shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Syria and Greece."

4 October 2005

With regard to the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates upon accession:

"The Government of the Hellenic Republic have examined the reservations made by the Government of the United Arab Emirates upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (New York, 18 December 1979).

The Government of the Hellenic Republic consider that the reservations in respect of Articles 2 (f), which is a core provision of the above Convention, 15 paragraph 2 and 16, all containing a reference to the provisions of the Islamic Shariah, are of unlimited scope and, therefore, incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic recall that, according to Article 28 paragraph 2 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

Consequently, the Government of the Hellenic Republic object to the aforementioned reservations made by the Government of the United Arab Emirates. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Greece and the United Arab Emirates."

29 January 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

"The Government of the Hellenic Republic have examined the reservations formulated by the Sultanate of Oman upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women of 18 December 1979.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic consider that the reservation to "all provisions of the Convention not in accordance with the provisions of the Islamic sharia and legislation in force in the Sultanate of Oman" is of unlimited scope and undefined character, while, furthermore, subjects the application of the Convention to the domestic law of the Sultanate of Oman. It is, therefore, incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Moreover, the Government of the Hellenic Republic consider that the reservations to articles 9 par. 2, 15 par. 4 and 16 do not specify the extent of the derogation therefrom and, therefore, are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic recall that, according to Article 28 paragraph 2 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

For these reasons, the Government of the Hellenic Republic object to the abovementioned reservations formulated by the Sultanate of Oman.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Greece and the Sultanate of Oman."

15 June 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Brunéi Darussalam upon accession:

"The Government of the Hellenic Republic consider that the reservation "regarding those provisions of the said Convention that may be contrary to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islam, the official religion of Brunei Darussalam" is of unlimited scope and undefined character, while furthermore, subjects the application of the Convention to the constitutional law of Brunei Darussalam and the beliefs and principles of Islam. It is, therefore, incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Moreover, the Government of the Hellenic Republic consider that the reservation to article 9 par. 2 does not specify the extent of the derogationtherefrom and, therefore, are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic recall that, according to Article 28 paragraph 2 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

For these reasons, the Government of the Hellenic Republic object to the abovementioned reservations formulated by Brunei Darussalam.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Greece and Brunei Darussalam."

HUNGARY

7 February 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

"The Government of the Republic of Hungary has examined the reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman on 7 February 2006 upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women of 18 December 1979. The reservations state the Sultanate of Oman does not consider itself bound by the provisions of the Convention that are not in accordance with the provisions of the Islamic Sharia and legislation in force in the Sultanate of Oman, and also state that it is not bound by Article 9 (2), Article 15 (4) and Article 16, subparagraphs (a), (c) and (f) of the Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary is of the opinion that by giving precedence to the principles of the Sharia and its own national law over the application of the provisions of the Convention, the Sultanate of Oman has made a reservation which leaves it unclear to what extent it feels bound by the obligations of the Convention and which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. Furthermore, the reservations to Article 9 (2), Article 15 (4) and Article 16 will unavoidably result in a legal situation that discriminates against women, which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Pursuant to Article 28 (2) of the Convention, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Hungary and the Sultanate of Oman."

24 April 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

"The Government of the Republic of Hungary has examined the reservation made by the Brunei Darussalam on 24 May 2006 upon accession to the Conventio on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women of 18 December 1979. The reservation states that the Brunei Darussalam does not consider itself bound by Article 9 (2) of the Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary is of the opinion that the reservation to Article 9 (2) will unavoidably result in a legal situation that discriminates against women, which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Pursuant to Article 28 (2) of the Convention, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservation. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Hungary and the Brunei Darussalam."

IRELAND

2 October 2001

With regard to the reservations made by Saudi Arabia upon ratification:

"The Government of Ireland has examined the reservation made, on 7 September 2000, by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, in respect of any divergence between the terms of the Convention and the norms of Islamic law. It has also examined the reservation made on the same date by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to Article 9, paragraph 2 of the Convention concerning the granting to women of equal rights with men with respect to the nationality of their children.

As to the former of the aforesaid reservations, the Government of Ireland is of the view that a reservation which consists of a general reference to religious law without specifying the content thereof and which does not clearly specify the provisions of the Convention to which it applies and the extent of the derogation therefrom, may cast doubts on the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. The Government of Ireland is furthermore of the view that such a general reservation may undermine the basis of international treaty law.

As to the reservation to Article 9, paragraph 2 of the Convention, the Government of Ireland considers that such a reservation aims to exclude one obligation of non-discrimination which is so important in the context of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women as to render this reservation contrary to the essence of the Convention. The Government of Ireland notes in this connection that Article 28, paragraph 2 of the Convention provides that a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Ireland moreover recalls that by ratifying the Convention, a State commits itself to adopt the measures required for the elimination ofdiscrimination, in all its forms and manifestations, against women.

The Government of Ireland therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Ireland and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia."

19 December 2006

With regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

"The Government of Ireland has examined the reservation made on 24 May 2006 by Brunei Darussalam to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women at the time of its accession thereto.

The Government of Ireland notes that Brunei Darussalam subjects application of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islam. The Government of Ireland is of the view that a reservation which consists of a general reference to religious law and to the Constitution of the reserving State and which does not clearly specify the provisions of the Convention to which it applies and the extent of the derogation therefrom, may cast doubts on the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. The Government of Ireland is furthermore of the view that such a general reservation may undermine the basis of international treaty law and is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of Ireland recalls that according to Article 28, paragraph 2 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Ireland further considers that the reservation made with respect to Article 9, paragraph 2 is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Ireland therefore objects tothe aforesaid reservations made by the Brunei Darussalam to the Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Ireland and Brunei Darussalam."

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

"The Government of Ireland has examined the reservation made on 7 February 2006 by the Sultanate of Oman to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women at the time of its accession thereto.

The Government of Ireland notes that the Sultanate of Oman subjects application of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women to the provisions of Islamic sharia and legislation in force in the Sultanate. The Government of Ireland is of the view that a reservation which consists of a general reference to religious law and to the Constitution of the reserving State and which does not clearly specify the provisions of the Convention to which it applies and the extent of the derogation therefrom, may cast doubts on the commitment of the reserving state to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. The Government of Ireland is furthermore of the view that such a general reservation may undermine the basis of international treaty law and is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of Ireland recalls that according to Article 28, paragraph 2 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Ireland further considers that the reservations made with respect to Article 9, paragraph 2, Article 15, paragraph 4 and Article 16 of the Convention are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Ireland therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Ireland and the Sultanate of Oman."

ITALY

2 September 2003

With regard to the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of Italy has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic at the time of its accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, regarding article 2, article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), and article 16, paragraph 2.

The Government of Italy considers that the reservations to article 2, article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g) are incompatible with the object and purpose of the above-mentioned Convention, as they contrast with the commitment of all parties to an effective implementation of the basic principles established in the Convention.

Furthermore, the Government of Italy underlines that the reservation with respect to article 16, paragraph 2, of the Convention, concerning the Islamic Sharia of the Syrian Arab Republic, may limit the responsibilities and obligations of the reserving State under the Convention, and therefore raises serious doubts about the real extent of the commitment undertaken by the Syrian Arab Republic at the time of its accession to the Convention.

The Government of Italy recalls that, according to article 28, paragraph 2 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

As a consequence, the Government of Italy objects to the above-mentioned reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection, however, shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Government of Italy and the Syrian Arab Republic."

15 June 2007

With regard to the reservations made by the Brunéi Darussalam upon accession:

"... the Government of Ialy has carefully examined the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam on 24 May 2006 upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women of 18 December 1979. The reservations state that Brunei Darussalam does not consider itself bound by provisions of the Convention that are contrary to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islam, in particular Article 9 (2) of the Convention.

The Government of Italy is of the opinion that by giving precedence to the beliefs and principles of Islam and its own constitutional law over the application of the provisions of the Convention, Brunei Darussalam has made a reservation which leaves it unclear to what extent it feels bound by the obligations of the Convention and which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. Furthermore, the reservation to Article 9 (2) will unavoidably result in a legal situation that discriminates against women, which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. Pursuant to Article 28 (2) of the Convention, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Italy therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Italy and Brunei Darussalam."

9 July 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

"..., the Government of Italy has carefully examined the reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman on 7 February 2006 upon accession to the above mentioned Convention. The reservations state that the Sultanate of Oman does not consider itself bound by provisions of the Convention that are not in accordance with the provisions of the Islamic Sharia and legislation in force in the Sultanate of Oman, and also state that it is not bound by Article 9 (2), Article 15 (4) and Article 16, subparagraphs (a), (c) and (f) of the Convention.

The Government of Italy is of the opinion that by giving precedence to the principles of the Sharia and its own national law over the application of the provisions of the Convention, the Sultanate of Oman has made a reservation which leaves it unclear to what extent it feels bound by the obligations of the Convention and which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. Pursuant to Article 28 (2) of the Convention, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Italy therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Italy and the Sultanate of Oman."

LATVIA

4 October 2005

With regard to the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates upon accession:

"The Government of the Republic of Latvia has carefully examined the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women upon accession to the Convention regarding Article 2 (f), Article 15 (2), and Article 16 thereof.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia considers that the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates contain general reference to national law without making specific reference to the extent of the obligations the United Arab Emirates are accepting.

Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Latvia is of the opinion that these reservations contradict to the object and purpose of the Convention and in particular to obligation all States Parties to pursue by all appropriate means and without delay a policy of eliminating discrimination against women.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia recalls Part VI, Article 28 of the Convention setting out that reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention are not permitted.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the United Arab Emirates to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Latvia and the United Arab Emirates."

6 December 2006

With regard to the reservations made by Brunéi Darussalam upon accession:

"The Government of the Republic of Latvia has carefully examined the reservations made by the Brunei Darussalam to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women upon accession to the Convention regrading paragraph 2 of Article 9, paragraph 1 of Article 29.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia considers that the ai of the said Convention is to grant the equality between men and women and therefore the distinction between genders regarding the rights to determinate the nationality of children is not in accordance with the aim of the said convention.

Moreover, the reservation made by the Brunei Darussalam regarding paragraph 1 of Article 29 is in accordance with the Convention and general principles of international law, because any state may declare that it is not bound by some mechanism of settlement of disputes.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia recalls Article 28 of the Convention setting out that reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention are not permitted.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia, therefore, objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Brunei Darussalam to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Latvia and the Brunei Darussalam. Thus, the Convention will become operative without the Brunei Darussalam benefiting from its reservation."

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

"The Government of the Republic of Latvia has carefully examined the reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women upon accession to the Convention regarding Article 9 paragraph 2, article 15 paragraph 4 and article 16.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia considers that the aim of the said Convention is to grant the equality between men and women and therefore the distinction between genders regarding the rights to determinate the nationality of children is not in accordance with the aim of the said convention.

Moreover, the rights to determine its own domicile, is a part of the free movement of person, is very important part of human rights and, thus no limitations may be permitted to the said right.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia is of the opinion that the equality between spouses is a very important issue and, therefore, no exemption regarding the said rights is acceptable.

Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Latvia is of the opinion that these reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman contradict to the object and purpose of the Convention and in particular to the obligation of all States Parties to pursue by all appropriate means and without delay a policy of eliminating the discrimination against women.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia recalls Part VI, Article 28 of the Convention setting out that reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention are not permitted.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia, therefore, objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Latvia and the Sultanate of Oman. Thus, the Convention will become operative without the Sultanate of Oman benefiting from its reservation."

MEXICO

11 January 1985

The Government of the United Mexican States has studied the content of the reservations made by Mauritius to article 11, paragraph 1 (b) and (d), and article 16, paragraph 1 (g), of the Convention and has concluded that they should be considered invalid in the light of article 28, paragraph 2, of the Convention, because they are incompatible with its object and purpose.

Indeed, these reservations, if implemented, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to all the articles of the Convention. The principles of equal rights of men and women and non-discrimination on the basis of sex, which are embodied in the second preambular paragraph and Article 1, paragraph 3, of the Charter of the United Nations, to which Mauritius is a signatory, and in articles 2 and 16 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948, were previously accepted by the Government of Mauritius when it acceded, on 12 December 1973, to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The above principles were stated in article 2, paragraph 1, and article 3 of the former Covenant and in article 2, paragraph 2, and article 3 of the latter. Consequently, it is inconsistent with these contractual obligations previously assumed by Mauritius for its Government now to claim that it has reservations, on the same subject, about the 1979 Convention.

The objection of the Government of the United Mexican States to the reservations in question should not be interpreted as an impediment to the entry into force of the 1979 Convention between the United Mexican States and Mauritius.

*Objections, identical in essence, mutatis mutandis, were also formulated by the Government of Mexico in regard to reservations made by various States, as follows [for the States which were not Parties to the Covenants (marked below with an asterisk *), the participation in the Covenants was not invoked by Mexico in its objection with regard to reservations]:*

i) 21 February 1985: In respect of reservations by Bangladesh* concerning article 2, article 13 (a) and article 16 paragraph 1 (c) and (f).

ii) 21 February 1985: In respect of the reservation by Jamaica concerning article 9 (2).

iii) 22 May 1985: In respect of reservations by New Zealand (applicable to the Cook Islands) concerning article 2 (f) and article 5 (a).

iv) 6 June 1985: In respect of reservations by the Republic of Korea concerning article 9 and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (e), (f) and (g). In this case, the Government of Mexico stated that the principles of the equal rights of men and women and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex, which are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations as one of its purposes in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 and in various multilateral instruments, have already become general principles of international law which apply to the international community, to which the Republic of Korea belongs.

v) 29 January 1986: In respect of the reservation made by Cyprus to article 9, paragraph 2.

vi) 7 May 1986: In respect of the reservations made by Turkey* to paragraphs 2 and 4 of article 15 and paragraphs 1 (c), 1 (d), 1 (f) and 1 (g) of article 16.

vii) 16 July 1986: In respect of reservations made by Egypt to articles 9 and 16.

viii) 16 October 1986: In respect of reservations by Thailand* concerning article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 3 and article 16.

ix) 4 December 1986: In respect of reservations by Iraq concerning article 2, paragraphs (f) and (g), article 9, paragraphs 1 and 2 and article 16.

x) 23 July 1990: In respect of the reservation made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

NETHERLANDS

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations made by Bangladesh regarding article 2, article 13 (a) and article 16, paragraph 1 (c) and (f), by Egypt regarding article 2, article 9 and article 16, by Brazil regarding article 15, paragraph 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (a), (c), (g), and (h), by Iraq regarding article 2, sub-paragraphs (f) and (g), article 9 and article 16, by Mauritius regarding article 11, paragraph 1 (b) and (d), and article 16, paragraph 1 (g), by Jamaica regarding article 9, paragraph 2, by the Republic of Korea regarding article 9 and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), by Thailand regarding article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 3, and article 16, by Tunisia regarding article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f), (g) and (h), by Turkey regarding article 15, paragraphs 2 and 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya upon accession, and the first paragraph of the reservations made by Malawi upon accession, are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2).

"These objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between Bangladesh, Egypt, Brazil, Iraq, Mauritius, Jamaica, the Republic of Korea, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi and the Kingdom of the Netherlands."

14 July1994

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the declarations made by India regarding article 5 (a) and article 16, paragraph 1. of the Convention are reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2).

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the declaration made by India regarding article 16, paragraph 2, of the Convention is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, para. 2).

The Government of the Kgdom of the Netherlands considers that the declaration made by Morocco expressing the readiness of Morocco to apply the provisions of article 2 provided that they do not conflict with the provisions of the Islamic *Shariah* , is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2).

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the declaration made by Morocco regarding article 15, paragraph 4, of the Convention is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2).

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations made by Morocco regarding article 9, paragraph 2, and article 16 of the Convention are reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2).

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Maldives [...]. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers the said reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the above-mentioned declarations and reservations.

These objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between India, Morocco, the Maldives and the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

16 January 1996

With regard to the reservations made by Kuwait upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers the reservations made by Kuwait incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2).

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the [said] reservations. These objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Kuwait and the Kingdom of the Netherlands."

15 October 1996

With regard to the reservations made by Malaysia upon accession:

"The Governmentof the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers ... that such reservations, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention by invoking the general principles of national law and the Constitution, may raise doubts as to the commitment of this State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties should be respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands further considers that the reservations made by Malaysia regarding article 2 (f), article 5 (a), article 9 and article 16 of the Convention are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Malaysia."

1 November 1996

With regard to the reservations made by Fiji upon accession and Lesotho upon ratification:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made for Malaysia.]

20 November 1996

With regard to the reservations made by Singapore upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands ... considers:

- that the reservation under (1) is incompatible with the purpose of the Convention;
- that the reservation under (2) suggests a distinction between migrating men and migrating women, and by that is an implicit reservation regarding article 9 of the Convention, which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention;
- that the reservation under (3), particularly the last part "...and considers that legislation in respect of article 11 is unnecessary for the minority of women who do not fall within the ambit of Singapore's employment legislation" is a reservation, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention by invoking the general principles of its national law, and in this particular case to exclude the application of the said article for a specific category of women, and therefore may raise doubts as to the commitment of this State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties should be respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties;

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Singapore and the Kingdom of the Netherlands."

30 May 1997

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made for Malaysia.]

1 July 1997

With regard to the reservations made by Algeria upon accession:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made for Malaysia.]

15 May 1998

With regard to the reservations regading article 9, paragraph 2, and article 16 first paragraph (c), (d), (f) and (g) made by Lebanon upon accession:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made for Kuwait.]

18 September 2001

With regard to the reservations made by Saudi Arabia upon ratification:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Government of Saudi Arabia at the time of its [ratification of] the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservation concning the national law of Saudi Arabia, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention by invoking national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of this State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands furthermore considers that the reservation made by Saudi Arabia regarding article 9, paragraph 2, of the Convention is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that according to paragraph 2 of Article 28 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party should be respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties. The Government of the Kingdomof the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Saudi Arabia to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Saudi Arabia."

With regard to the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea regarding article 2, paragraph (f), and article 9, paragraph 2, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women made at the time of its accession to the said Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea regarding article 2, paragraph (f), and article 9, paragraph 2, of the Convention are reservations incompatible with theject and purpose of the Convention. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to paragraph 2 of Article 28 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to take all appropriate measures, including legislation to comply with their obligations.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the afore-said reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea."

8 February 2002

With regard to the reservation made by Mauritania upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservation made by the Government of Mauritania at the time of its accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and considers that the reservation concerning the Islamic Sharia and the national law of Mauritania, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention by invoking the Sharia and national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of this State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to paragraph 2 of Article 28 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Mauritania to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Mauritania."

22 November 2002

With regard to the reservations made by Bahrain upon accession:

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Government of Bahrain at the time of its accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations with respect to article 9, paragraph 2, and article 15, paragraph 4, of the Convention are reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Furthermore, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations with respect to articles 2 and 16 of the Convention, concerning the Islamic Shariah of Bahrain, reservations which seek to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention by invoking the Islamic Shariah, may raise doubts as to the commitment of this State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to paragraph 2 of Article 28 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared toundertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Bahrain to the Convention on the

Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Bahrain.

27 May 2003

With regard to the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic at the time of its accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations with respect to article 2, article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), of the Convention are reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Furthermore, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservation with respect to article 16, paragraph 2, of the Convention, concerning the Islamic Shariah of the Syrian Arab Republic, a reservation which seeks to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention by invoking the Islamic Shariah, may raise doubts as to the commitment of this State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to paragraph 2 of article 28 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all Pares and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Syrian Arab Republic."

31 May 2005

With regard to the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates upon accession:

"The Government of the Netherlands has examined the reservation made by the United Arab Emirates to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

The application of the Articles 2 (f), 15 (2) and 16 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women has been made subject to religious considerations. This makes it unclear to what extent the United Arab Emirates considers itself bound by the obligations of the treaty and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the United Arab Emirates to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

It is of the common interest of States that all parties respect treaties to which they have chosen to become parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation which is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted (Art. 19 c).

The Government of the Netherlands therefore objects to the reservation made by the United Arab Emirates to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the United Arab Emirates and the Kgdom of the Netherlands, without the United Arab Emirates benefiting from its reservation."

19 July 2006

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

"The Government of the Netherlands has examined the reservation made by Oman to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations with respect to article 9, paragraph 2; article 15, paragraph 4; and article 16, of the Convention are reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Furthermore, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that with the first part of the reservation the application of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women is made subject to the provisions of the Islamic sharia and legislation in force in the Sultanate of Oman. This makes it unclear to what extent Oman considers itself bound by the obligations of the treaty and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of Oman to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to paragraph 2 of article 28 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaidreservations made by the Government of Oman to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Oman."

11 April 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Brunéi Darussalam upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservation with respect to article 9, paragraph 2, of the Convention is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Furthermore, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that with the first reservation the application of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women is made subject to the beliefs and principles of Islam and the provisions of constitutional law in force in Brunei Darussalam. This makes it unclear to what extent Brunei Darussalam considers itself bound by the obligations of the Convention and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of Brunei Darussalam to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to paragraph 2 of article 28 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Brunei Darussalam to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Brunei."

POLAND

28 November 2005

With regard to the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates upon accession:

"The Government of the Republic of Poland has examined the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 18, 1979, hereinafter called the Convention, regarding articles 2 (f), 9, 15 (2) and 16.

The Government of the Republic of Poland considers that the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention which guarantees equal rights of women and men to exercise their economic, social, cultural, civil and political rights. The Government of the Republic of Poland therefore considers that, according to the customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (article 19 (c)), done at Vienna on 23 May 1969, as well as article 28 (2) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Republic of Poland therefore objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the United Arab Emirates upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 18 December 1979, regarding articles 2 (f), 9, 15 (2) and 16.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Poland and the United Arab Emirates."

1 March 2007

With regard to the reservations made Oman upon accession:

The Government of the Republic of Poland has examined the reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, adopted by General Assembly of the United Nations on December 18, 1979, regarding articles 9 paragraph 2, 15 paragraph 4, 16 (a), (c) and (f) and all provisions of the Convention not in accordance with the principles of the Islamic *Sharia* .

The Government of the Republic of Poland considers that the reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention which guarantees equal rights of women and men to exercise their economic, social, cultural, civil, and political rights. The Government of the Republic of Poland therefore considers that, according to article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, done at Vienna on 23 May 1969, as well as article 28 (2) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Form of Discrimination against Women, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Poland considers that by making a general reference to the Islamic *Sharia* without indicating the provisions of the Convention to which the Islamic *Sharia* applies, the Sultanate of Oman does not specify the exact extent of the introduced limitations and thus does not define precisely enough the extent to which the Sultanate of Oman has accepted the obligations under the Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Poland therefore objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, adopted by General Assembly of the United Nations on 18 December 1979, regarding articles 9 paragraph 2, 15 paragraph 4, 16 (a), (c) and (f) and all provisions of the Convention not in accordance with the principles of the Islamic *Sharia* .

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Poland and Sultanate of Oman.

7 June 2007

With regard to the reservations made b Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

"The Government of the Republic of Poland has examined the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, adopted by General Assembly of the United Nations on December 18, 1979, regarding article 9 paragraph 2 and those provisions of the Convention that may be contrary to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islam.

The Government of the Republic of Poland considers that the reservations made by the Brunei Darussalam are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention which guarantees equal rights of women and men to exercise their economic, social, cultural, civil, and political rights. The Government of the Republic of Poland therefore considers that, according to article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, done at Vienna on 23 May 1969, as well as article 28 (2) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Poland considers that by making a general reference to the 'beliefs and principles of Islam' without indicating the provisions of the Convention to which they apply, Brunei Darussalam does not specify the exact extent of the introduced limitations and thus does not define precisely enough the extent to which Brunei Darussalam has accepted the obligations under the Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Poland therefore objects to the aforementioned reservations made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, adopted by General Assembly of the United Nations on 18 December 1979, regarding article 9 paragraph 2 and those provisions of the Convention that may be contrary to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam anto the beliefs and principles of Islam.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Poland and Brunei Darussalam."

PORTUGAL

26 October 1994

With regard to the reservations made by Maldives upon accession:

"The Government of Portugal considers that the reservations formulated by the Maldives are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and they are inadmissible under article19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Furthermore, the Government of Portugal considers that these reservations cannot alter or modify in any respect the obligations arising from the Convention for any State party thereto."

18 July 2001

With regard to the reservations made by Saudi Arabia upon ratification :

"The Government of the Portuguese Republic has examined the reservation made on 7 September by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (New York, 18 December 1979), regarding any interpretation of the provisions of the Convention that is incompatible with the precept of Islamic law and the Islamic religion. It has also examined the reservation to article 9.2 of the Convention.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic is of the view that the first reservation refers in general terms to the Islamic law, failing to specify clearly its content and, therefore, leaving the other State parties with doubts as to the real extent of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia's commitment to the Convention.

Furthermore, it also considers the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia incompatible with the objective and purpose of the aforesaid Convention, for it refers to the whole of the Convention, and it seriously limits or even excludes its application on a vaguely defined basis, such as the global reference to the Islamic law.

Regarding the reservation to article 9.2, the Government of the Portuguese Republic is of the view that the said reservation intends to exclude one of the obligations of non-discrimination, which is the essnce of the Convention.

Therefore, the Government of the Portuguese Republic objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Portuguese Republic and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia."

4 March 2002

With regard to the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon accession :

"The Government of the Portuguese Republic has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (New York, 18 December 1979) on 27 February 2001 in respect of articles 2 (f) and 9.2 of the Convention.

Recalling that, according tp paragraph 2 of Article 28 of the Convention a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted, the Government of the Portuguese Republic objects to the said reservations.

In fact, the reservation relating to article 2 (f) refers to a basic aspect of the Convention, namely the compromise to enact legislation to abolish all existing legal practices discriminating against women.

Regarding the reservation to article 9.2, the Government of the Portuguese Republic is of the view that the said reservation intends to exclude one of the specific obligations of non-discrimination, which is the essence of the Convention.

It is in the common interests of States that Treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected by all parties and that the States are prepared to take all appropriate measures, including legislation to comply with their obligations.

Therefore, the Government of the Portuguese Republic objects to the afore mentioned reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the Convention on the Elination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Portuguese Republic and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea."

With regard to the reservation made by Mauritania upon accession:

"The Government of the Portuguese Republic has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (New York, 18 December 1979) on 10 May 2001 in respect of any interpretation of the provisions of the Convention that it is incompatible with the precept of Islamic law and its Constitution.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic is of the view that the said reservation refers in a general manner to national law, failing to specify clearly its content and, therefore, leaving the other State parties with doubts as to the real extent of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania's commitment to the Convention.

Furthermore it also considers the reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania incompatible with the objective and purpose of the aforesaid Convention, and it seriously limits or even excludes its application on a vaguely defined basis, such as the global reference to the Islamic law.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Portuguese Republic and the Islamic Republic of Mauritania."

28 November 2005

With regard to the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates upon accession:

"The Portuguese Government has carefully examined the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates upon its accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW).

Most of these reservations concern fundamental provisions of the Convention, such as articles 2 (f), 9, 15 (2) and 16, since they outline the measures which a State Party is required to take in order to implement the Convention, cover the fundamental rights of women and deal with the key elements for the elimination of discrimination against women.

Portugal considers that such reservations, consisting of references to the precepts of the Shariah and to national legislation, create serious doubts as to the commitment of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the Convention and to the extent it has accepted the obligations imposed by it and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international law.

It is in the common interest of all States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic, therefore, objects to the above reservations made by the United Arab Emirates to the CEDAW.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Portugal and the United Arab Emirates."

30 January 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

"The first reservation concerns "all provisions of the Convention not in accordance with the provisions of the Islamic sharia and legislation in force in the Sultanate of Oman". Portugal considers that this reservation is too general and vague and seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on an unilateral basis that is not authorised by it. Moreover, this reservation creates doubts as to the commitment of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contributes to undermining the basis of international law. It is in the common interest of allStates that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The second, third and fourth reservations concern fundamental provisions of the Convention, such as articles 9 (2), 15 (4) and 16, that cover the fundamental rights of women and deal with the key elements for the elimination of discrimination against women on the basis of sex. These reservations are thus incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and are not permitted under article 28 (2) of the CEDAW.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic, therefore, objects to the above mentioned reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman to the CEDAW.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Portugal and Oman."

With regard to the reservationsmade by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

"The reservation concerning the "provisions of the said Convention that may be contrary to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islam, the official religion of Brunei Darussalam" is too general and vague and seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis that is not authorised by it. Moreover, this reservation creates doubts as to the commitment of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contributes to undermining the basis of international law. It is in the common interest of all States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The reservation concerning article 9 (2) undermines a key provision of the Convention concerning the elimination of discrimination against women on the bsis of sex. This reservation is thus incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and is not permitted under article 28 (2) of the CEDAW.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic, therefore, objects to the above mentioned reservations made by the Government of Brunei Darussalam to the CEDAW.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Portugal and Brunei Darussalam."

ROMANIA

3 December 2003

With regard to the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession :

"The Government of Romania has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic at the time of its accession to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women, regarding article 2, article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, article 16 paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), and article 16 paragraph 2.

The Government of Romania considers that the reservations to article 2, article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, article 16 paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), article 16 paragraph 2, of the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women are incompatible with the object and purpose of the above-mentioned Convention, taking into account the provisions of article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (1969).

As a consequence, the Government of Romania objects to the above-mentioned reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection, however, shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Government of Romania and the Syrian Arab Republic."

8 February 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

"The Government of Romania has carefully considered the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam on 24 May 2006 upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (New York), 18 December 1979) and regards the reservation made to Article 9 para. 2 as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, as, by its formulation, a certain form of discrimination against women is maintained and, implicitly, the inequality of rights between men and women is perpetuated.

Furthermore, the Government of Romania is of the opinion that the general reservation made by Brunei Darussalam subjects the application of the provisions of the Convention to their compatibility with the Islamic law and the fundamental law of this State. This reservation is, thus, problematic as it raises questions with regard to the actual obligations Brunei Darussalam understood to undertake by acceding to the Convention, and with regard to its commitment to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Romania recalls that, pursuant to Article 28 para. 2 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

Consequently, the Government of Romania objects to the aforementioned reservations made by Brunei Darussalam to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention, in its entirety, between Romania and Brunei Darussalam.

The Government of Romania recommends to Brunei Darussalam to reconsider the reservations made to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women."

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

"The Government of Romania has carefully considered the reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman on 7 February 2006 upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (New York, 18 December 1979) and regards the reservations made to Article 9 para. 2, Article 15 para.4 and Article 16, sub-paragraphs a), c) and f) (concerning adoptions), as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, as, by their formulation, various forms of discrimination against women are maintained and, implicitly, the inequality of rights between men and women is perpetuated.

Furthermore, the Government of Romania is of the opinion that the general reservation made by the Sultanate of Oman subjects the application of the provisions of the Convention to their compatibility with the Islamic law and the national legislation in force in the Sultanate of Oman. This reservation is, thus, problematic as it raises questions with regard to the actual obligations the Sultanate of Oman understood to undertake by acceding to the Convention, and with regard to its commitment to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Romania recalls that, pursuant to Article 28 para. 2 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

Consequently, the Government of Romania objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention, in its entirety, between Romania and the Sultanate of Oman.

The Government of Romania recommends to the Sultanate of Oman to reconsider the reservations made to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women."

SLOVAKIA

27 February 2007

With regard to the reservation made by Oman upon accession:

"The Government of Slovakia has carefully examined the reservation made by the Sultanate of Oman upon its accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDA W).

The Government of Slovakia is of the view that the general reservation made by the Sultanate of Oman that "all provisions of the Convention not in accordance with the provisions of the Islamic sharia and legislation in force in the Sultanate of Oman" is too general and does not clearly specify the extent of the obligation (mentioned in the Convention) for the Sultanate of Oman.

The Government of Slovakia finds the reservation to article 9 (2), article 15 (4) and article 16 incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and is therefore inadmissible under article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. Therefore it shall not be permitted, in accordance with article 2[8], paragraph 2 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

For these reasons, the Government of Slovakia objects to the above mentioned reservation made by the Sultanate of Oman upon its accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women between Slovakia and the Sultanate of Oman. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between Slovakia and the Sultanate of Oman, without the Sultanate of Oman benefitting from its reservation. "

11 May 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

"The Government of Slovakia has carefully examined the content of the reservations made by the Brunei Darussalam upon its accession to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination againt Women (CEDAW).

The Government of Slovakia is of the opinion that the reservation containing the reference to the beliefs and principles of Islam is too general and raises serious doubt as to the commitment of Brunei Darussalam to the object and the purpose of the Convention.

Moreover, the Government of Slovakia considers that one of the aims of the Convention is to grant the equality between men and women with respect to determine the nationality of their children. Therefore it finds the reservation of Brunei Darussalam to paragraph 2 of article 9 of the Convention as undermining one of key provisions of the Convention and is incompatible with its object and purpose. It is therefore inadmissible and shall be permitted, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 28 of the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women.

For these reasons, the Government of Slovakia objects to the above mentioned reservations made by the Brunei Darussalam upon its accession to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Slovakia and the Brunei Darussalam. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between Slovakia and the Brunei Darussalam without the Brunei Darussalam benefiting from its reservations."

SPAIN

22 February 2001

With regard to the reservations made by Saudi Arabia upon ratification :

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women on [7] September 2000, regarding any interpretation of the Convention that may be incompatible with the norms of Islamic law and regarding article 9, paragraph 2.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that the general reference to Islamic law, without specifying its content, creates doubts among the other States parties about the extent to which the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia commits itself to fulfil its obligations under the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain is of the view that such a reservation by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, since it refers to the Convention as a whole and seriously restricts or even excludes its application on a basis as ill-defined as the general reference to Islamic law.

Furthermore, the reservation to article 9, paragraph 2, aims at excluding one of the obligations concerning non-discrimination, which is the ultimate goal of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain recalls that according to article 28, paragraph 2, of the Convention, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

Therefore, the Government of the Kingdom of Spain objects to the said reservations by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Spain and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

5 July 2001

With regard to the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon accessn :

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to articles 2 (f) and 9 (2) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, on 27 February 2001 in acceding to the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers those reservations to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, since their intent is to exempt the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from committing itself to two essential elements of the Convention, one being the general requirement to take measures, including legislation, to eliminate all forms of discrimination against women (article 2 (f)) and the other being the requirement to address a specific form of discrimination with respect to the nationality of children (article 9 (2)).

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain recalls that, under article 28 (2) of the Convention, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention are not permitted.

Accordingly, the Government of the Kingdom of Spain objects to the above-mentioned reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection does not prevent the Convention's entry into force between the Kingdom of Spain and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

31 July 2003

With regard to the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession :

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to article 2; article 9, paragraph 2; article 15, paragraph 4; and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g) and paragraph 2 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, upon acceding to the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain deems the above-mentioned reservations be contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, since they affect fundamental obligations of States parties thereunder. Moreover, the reservation to article 16, paragraph 2, of the Convention refers to the Islamic Shariah, without specifying its content, which raises doubts as to the degree of commitment of the Syrian Arab Republic in acceding to the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain recalls that, under article 28, paragraph 2, of the Convention, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention are not permitted.

Accordingly, the Government of the Kingdom of Spain objects to the reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection does not prevent the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Spain and the Syrian Arab Republic.

6 October 2005

With regard to the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates upon accession:

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has examined the reservations entered by the Government of the United Arab Emirates to article 2, subparagraph (f); article 9; article 15, paragraph 2; and article 16 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women upon its accession to that instrument on 6 October 2004.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that these reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, since they are intended to exempt the United Arab Emirates from obligations relating to essential aspects of the Convention: one of a general nature, namely the adoption of measures, including legislation, to eliminate all forms of discrimination against women (article 2, subparagraph (f)), and others concerning specific forms of discrimination in relation to nationality (article 9), legal capacity in civil matters (article 15, paragraph 2) and marriage and family relations(article 16).

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain recalls that, under article 28, paragraph 2, of the Convention, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention are not permitted.

Moreover, the reservation to article 16 of the Convention makes a general reference to the principles of Islamic law without specifying their content, with the result that the other States parties cannot precisely determine the extent to which the Government of the United Arab Emirates accepts the obligations set out in article 16 of the Convention.

Accordingly, the Government of the Kingdom of Spain objects to the reservations entered by the Government of the United Arab Emirates to article 2, subparagraph (f); article 9; article 15, paragraph 2; and article 16 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Spain and the United Arab Emirates.

23 February 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has examined the reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women regarding all the provisions of the Convention which are incompatible with Islamic law and with the legislation in force in Oman and to articles 9 (2), 15 (4) and 16 of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that the first part of the reservation which subordinates all the provisions of the Convention to conform to Islamic law and the legislation in force in Oman, to which it makes general reference, without specifying its content, does not permit clear determination as to the extent to which Oman has accepted the obligations derived under the Convention and, consequently, such reservation sheds doubt as to the extent to which the Sultanate of Oman is committed to the object and purpose of the Convention.

Furthermore, the reservations to articles 9 (2), 15 (4) and 16 are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, which aim at exempting Oman from its commitment essential obligations of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain recalls that according to article 28 (2) of the Convention, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

Therefore, the Government of the Kingdom of Spain objects to the reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman to all the provisions of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women which are incompatible with Islamic law and with the legislation in force in Oman and to articles 9 (2), 15 (4) and 16 of the Convention.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Spain and the Sultana of Oman.

13 June 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has examined the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam upon acceding to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women regarding all the provisions of the Convention that may be contrary to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islam, and regarding article 9.2 of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain believes that, by making the implementation of the provisions of the Convention subject to their compatibility with the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and with the beliefs and principles of Islam, Brunei Darussalam has made a reservation which does not permit a clear determination of the extent to which it has accepted the obligations deriving from the Convention and that, consequently, the reservation raises doubts about the commitment of Brunei Darussalam to the object and purpose of the Convention. Moreover, the reservation regarding article 9.2 would exempt Brunei Darussalam from its commitment in relation to an essential element of the Convention and allow the continuation of a situation of de jure discrimination against women on grounds of sex which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain recalls that, under article 28.2 of the Convention, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention are not permitted.

Accordingly, the Government of the Kingdom of Spain objects to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam regarding those provisions of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women that may be contrary to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islam and regarding article 9.2 of the Convention.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Spain and Brunei Darussalam.

SWEDEN

17 March 1986

"The Government of Sweden considers that [the following reservations] are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2) and therefore objects to them:

- Thailand regarding article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 3 and article 16;
- Tunisia regarding article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f), (g) and (h).
- Bangladesh regarding article 2, article 13 (a) and article 16, paragraph 1 (c) and (f);
- Brazil regarding article 15, paragraph 4 and article 16, paragraph 1 (a), (c), (g) and (h);

"Indeed the reservations in question, if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to everything the Convention stands for. It should also be borne in mind that the principles of the equal rights of men and women and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations as one of its purposes, in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 and in various multilateral instruments, to which Thailand, Tunisia and Bangladesh are parties.

"The Government of Sweden furthermore notes that, as a matter of principle, the same objection could be made to the reservations made by:

- Egypt regarding article 2, article 9, paragraph 2, and article 16,
- Mauritius regarding article 11, paragraph 1 (b) and (d), and article 16, paragraph 1 (g),
- Jamaica regarding article 9, paragraph 2
- Republic of Korea regarding article 9 and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g)
- New Zealand in respect of the Cook Islands regarding article 2, paragraph (f) and article 5, paragraph (a).

"In this context the Government of Sweden wishes to take this opportunity tomake the observation that the reason why reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are not acceptable is precisely that otherwise they would render a basic international obligation of a contractual nature meaningless. Incompatible reservations, made in respect of the Convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women, do not only cast doubts on the commitments of the reserving states to the objects and purpose of this Convention, but moreover, contribute to undermine the basis of international contractual law. It is in the common interest of states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties also are respected, as to object and purpose, by other parties."

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, from the Government of Sweden, objections of the same nature as the one above with regard to reservations made by the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

- 12 March 1987 with regard to the reservation made by Iraq in respect of article 2, paragraph (f) and (g), article 9, paragraph 1, and article 16;
- 15 April 1988 with regard to the first reservations made by Malawi;
- 25 May 1990 with regard to the reservation made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya;
- 5 February 1993 with regard to the reservations made by Jordan in respect of article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, the wording of article 16 (c), and article 16 (d) and (g);
- 26 October 1994 with regard to the reservations made by Maldives upon accession. *The Government of Sweden also stated that:* "The Government of Sweden therefore objects to these reservations and considers that they constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Sweden and the Republic of Maldives.";
- 17 January 1996 with regard to the reservations made by Kuwait upon accession;
- 27 January 1998 with regard to the reservations made by Lebanon upon accession.
- 27 April 2000 with regard to the reservations to articles 2 , 5, 15 and 16 made by Niger upon accession.

30 March 2001

With regard to the reservations made by Saudi Arabia upon ratification:

"The Government of Swedehas examined the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia at the time of its ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, as to any interpretation of the provisions of the Convention that is incompatible with the norms of Islamic law.

The Government of Sweden is of the view that this general reservation, which does not clearly specify the provisions of the convention to which it applies and the extent of the derogation therefrom, raises doubts as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the object and purpose of the Convention.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have been chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to customary law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid general reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the Kingdom of Sweden, without the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia benefiting from the said reservation".

25 July 2001

With regard to the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea at the time of its accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, regarding articles 2 (f) and 9 (2) of the Convention.

The reservation in question, if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. It should be borne in mind that the principles of the equal rights of men and women and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex are set forth in te Charter of the United Nations as one of the purposes of the organisation, as well as in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

According to Article 28 (2) of the Convention, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the Conventionon the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and considers the reservation null and void. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without the Democratic People's Republic of Korea benefiting from its reservation".

21 January 2002

With regard to the reservation made by Mauritania upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by Mauritania upon acceding to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

The Government of Sweden notes that the Convention is being made subject to a general reservation of unlimited scope referring to the contents of Islamic Sharia and to existing legislation in Mauritania.

The Government of Sweden is of the view that this reservation which does not clearly specify the provisions of the Convention to which it applies, and the extent of the derogation therefrom, raises serious doubts as to the commitment of Mauritania to the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of Sweden would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Mauritania to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

The objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Mauritania and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Mauritania benefiting from its reservation."

27 November 2002

With regard to the reservation made by Bahrain upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by Bahrain upon acceding to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, regarding articles 2, 9(2), 15(4) and 16.

The reservation to articles 9(2) and 15(4), if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. It should be borne in mind that the principles of the equal rights of men and women and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations as one of the purposes of the organisation, as well as in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

The reservation to articles 2 and 16 make general references to Islamic sharia. The Government of Sweden is of the view that, in absence of further clarification, this reservation which does not clearly specify the extent of Bahrain's derogation from the provisions in question raises serious doubts as to the commitment of Bahrain to the object and purpose of the Convention.

According to article 28(2) of the Convention, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Bahrain to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women and considers the reservation null and void.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Bahrain and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Bahrain benefiting from its reservation."

11 July 2003

With regard to the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon acceding to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women regarding article 2, article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4 and article 16, paragraphs 1 (c), (d), (f) (g) and 2 of the Convention.

Article 2 of the Convention is one of the core articles of the Convention. A general reservation to this article seriously raises doubts as to the commitment of the Syrian Arab Republic to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The reservations to articles 9, paragraph 2, article 15,paragraph 4 and article 16, paragraphs 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. It should be borne in mind that the principles of the equal rights of men and women and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations as one of the purposes of the organisation, as well as in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

The reservation to article 16, paragraph 2, makes a general reference to islamic sharia. The Government of Sweden is of the view that in the absence of further clarification, this reservation which does not clearly specify the extent of the Syrian Arab Republic's derogation from the provision in question raises serious doubts as to the commitment of the Syrian Arab Republic to the object and purpose of the Convention.

According to article 28, paragraph 2, of the Convention, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of all States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Syrian Arab Republic and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without the Syrian Arab Republic benefiting from its reservations."

25 August 2005

With regard to the reservations made by Micronesia (Federated States of) upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden is of the view that this reservation raises serious doubts as to the commitment of the Government of Micronesia to the object and purpose of the Convention. The reservation would, if put into practice, result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex. It should be borne in mind that the principles of the equal right of men and women and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations as one of the purposes of the organisation, as well as in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

According to article 28 (2) of the Convention, and to customary law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia to the Convention to the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and considers the reservation null and void. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without the Federated States of Micronesia benefiting from its reservations."

5 October 2005

With regard to the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservations made by United Arab Emirates upon acceding to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, regarding Article 2 (f), 9, 15 (2) and 16.

The Government of Sweden notes that the said articles are being made subject to reservations referring to national legislation and Sharia principles.

The Government of Swedenis of the view that these reservations which do not clearly specify the extent of the United Arab Emirates' derogation from the provisions in question raises serious doubts as to the commitment of the United Arab Emirates to the object and purpose of the Convention. The reservations in question, if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. It should be borne in mind that the principles of the equal rights of women and men and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations as one of the purposes of the organization, as well as in the declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

According to article 28 (2) of the Convention, and to international customary law as codified in the Vienna convention on the Law of the Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the United Arab Emirates to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women and considers them null and void.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Arab Emirates and Sweden. The convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without the United Arab Emirates benefiting from its reservations."

6 February 2007

With regard to the reservations made Oman upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman on 7 February 2006 to the Conventionon the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

The Government of Sweden notes that the Sultanate of Oman gives precedence to the provisions of Islamic Sharia and national legislation over the application of the provisions of the Convention. The Government of Sweden is of the view that this reservation which does not clearly specify the extent of the Sultanate of Oman's derogation from the provisions in question raises serious doubt as to the commitment of the Sultanate of Oman to the object and purpose of the Convention.

Furthermore, the Government of Sweden considers that, regarding the reservations made with respect to articles 9 (2), 15 (4), 16 (a, c, f), if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. It should be borne in mind that the principles of the equal rights of women and men and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations as one of the purposes of the organization, as well as the declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

According to article 28 (2) of the Convention and to international customary law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties, are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and considers them null and void.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Sultanate of Oman and Sweden. The Conventon enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without the Sultanate of Oman benefiting from its reservations."

12 February 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam on 24 May 2006 to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

The Government of Sweden notes that Brunei Darussalam gives precedence to the beliefs and principles of Islam and national legislation over the application of the provisions of the Convention. The Government of Sweden is of the view that this reservation which does not clearly specify the extent of Brunei Darussalam's derogation from the provisions in questions raises serious doubt as to the commitment of Brunei Darussalam to the object and purpose of the Convention.

Furthermore, the Government of Sweden considers that, regarding the reservation made with respect to article 9 (2), if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. It should be borne in mind that the principles of the equal rights of women and men and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations as one of the purposes of the organization, as well as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

According to article 28 (2) of the Convention and to international customary law, as codified in the Vienna convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties, to which they have chosen to become parties, are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

TheGovernment of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by Brunei Darussalam to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and considers them null and void.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Brunei Darussalam and Sweden. The convention enters int force in its entirety between the two States without Brunei Darussalam benefiting from its reservations."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

6 September 2001

With regard to the reservation made by Saudi Arabia upon ratification:

"The Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honour to refer to the reservation made on 7 September 2000 by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, done at New York on 18 December 1979, which reads as follows:

"In case of contradiction between any term of the Convention and the norms of Islamic Law, the Kingdom is not under obligation to observe the contradictory terms of the Convention."

The Government of the United Kingdom note that a reservation which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define for other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government [of] the Kingdom of the Saudi Arabia.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia."

28 November 2001

With regard to the reservation made by Mauritania upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have examined the reservation made by the Government of Mauritania in respect of the Convention, which reads as follows:

'Having seen and examined the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, adopted by the UN General Assembly on 18 December 1979, have approved and do approve it in each and every one of its parts which are not contrary to Islamic Sharia and are in accordance with our Constituti'.

The Government of the United Kingdom note that a reservation to a Convention which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the reservation made by the Government of Mauritania.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Mauritania."

5 March 2002

With regard to the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republique of Korea upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on 27 February in respect of the Convention, which reads as follows:

'The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph (f) of Article 2...of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.'

Paragraph (f) of Article 2 requires States Parties to take all appropriate measures, including legislation, to modify or abolish existing laws, regulations, customs and practices which constitute discrimination against women. The Government of the United Kingdom notes that a reservation which excludes obligations of such a general nature does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea."

26 June 2003

With regard to the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom have examined the reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (New York, 18 December 1979) on 28 March 2003 in respect of Article 2; and Article 16, paragraphs 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), concerning equal rights and responsibilities during marriage and at its dissolution with regard to guardianship, the right to choose a family name, maintenance and adoption; and article 16, paragraph 2, concerning the legal effect of the betrothal and the marriage of a child, inasmuch as this provision is incompatible with the provisions of the Islamic Shariah.

The Government of the United Kingdom note that the Syrian reservation specifies particular provisions of the Convention Articles to which the reservation is addressed. Nevertheless this reservation does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Syrian Arab Republic."

With regard to the reservations made by Bahrain upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom have examined the reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (New York, 18 December 1979) on 18 June 2002 in respect of Article 2, in order to ensure its implementation within the bounds of the provisions of the Islamic Shariah; and Article 16, in so far as it is incompatible with the provisions of the Islamic Shariah.

The Government of the United Kingdom note that a reservation which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Kingdom of Bahrain."

17 August 2005

With regard to the reservations made by the United Arab Emriates upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom have examined the reservations made by the Government of the United Arab Emirates to [the] Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (New York, 18 December 1979) on 6 October 2004 in respect of Articles 2 (f), 15 (2), and 16 on the applicability of Sharia law.

The Government of the United Kingdom note that a reservation which consists of a general reference to a system of law without specifying its contents does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the United Arab Emirates.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United Arab Emirates."

With regard to the reservations made by the Micronesia (Federated States of) upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom have examined the reservations made by the Government of Micronesia to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (New York, 18 December 1979) on 9 September 2004 in respect of Article 11 (1) (d) on the enactment of comparable worth legislation.

The Government of the United Kingdom object to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Micronesia.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Micronesia."

28 February 2007

With regard to the reservations made Oman upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom have examined the reservations made by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (New York, 18 December 1979).

In the view of the Government of the United Kingdom a reservation should clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. A reservation which consists of a general reference to a system of law without specifying its contents does not do so. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the Sultanate of Oman's reservation from "all provisions of the Convention not in accordance with the provisions of the Islamic Sharia and legislation in force in the Sultanate of Oman".

The Government of the United Kingdom further object to the Sultanate of Oman's reservations from Article 15, paragraph 4 and Article 16 of the Convention.

These objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Oman."

14 June 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

"The Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations.....has the honour to refer to the reservations made by the Government of Brunei Darussalam to the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Agains Women (New York, 18 December 1979), which read:

'The Government of Brunei Darussalam expresses its reservations regarding those provisions of the said Convention that may be contrary to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islam, the official religion of Brunei Darussalam and, without prejudice to the generality of the said reservations, expresses its reservations regarding paragraph 2 of Article 9 and paragraph 1 of Article 29 of the Convention.'

In the view of the United Kingdom a reservation should clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. A reservation which consists of a general reference to a system of law without specifying its contents does not do so. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the reservations made by the Government of Brunei Darussalam.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Brunei Darussalam."

Notes:

[1] *Resolution 34/180, Official Records of the General Assembly of the United Nations, Thirty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 46* (A/34/46), p. 193.

[2] Upon ratification, the Government of Australia made the following reservations:

"The Government of Australia states that maternity leave with pay is provided in respect of most women employed by the Commonwealth Government and the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria. Unpaid maternity leave is provided in respect of all other women employed in the State of New South Wales and elsewhere to women employed under Federal and some State industrial awards. Social Security benefits subject to income tests are available to women who are sole parents.

"The Government of Australia advises that it is not at present in a position to take the measures required by article 11 (2) to introduce maternity leave with pay or with comparable social benefits throughout Australia.

The Government of Australia advises that it does not accept the application of the Convention is so far as it would require alteration of Defence Force policy which exludes women for combat and combat-related duties. The Governnment of Australia is reviewing this policy do as to more closely define 'combat' and ' combat-related dutes."

On 30 August 2000, the Government of Australia notified the Secretary-General of the following:

"The Government of Australia having considered the reservations [made upon ratification], hereby withdraws that part of the reservations which states:

The Goverment of Australia advises that it does not accept the application of the Convention in so far as it would require alteration of Defence Force policy which excludes women from combat and combat-related duties. The Government of Australia is reviewing this policy so as to more closely define 'combat' and 'combat-related duties'."

The complete text of the reservations is published in United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1325, p. 378.

[3] Upon ratification, the Government of Austria made the following reservation:

"Austria reserves its right to apply the provision of article 7 (b), as far as service in the armed forces is concerned, and the provision of article 11, as far as night work of women and special protection of working women is concerned, within the limits established by national legislation."

On 11 September 2000, the Government of Austria informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withraw the reservation to article 7 (b) of the Convention made upon ratification.

Further on 14 September 2006, the Government of Austria informed the Secretary-General of the following:

"The reservation formulated by the Republic of Austria to Article 11 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women on the occasion of ratification is withdrawn with regard to the night work of women. The Republic of Austria maintains the reservation with regard to the special protection of working women."

The complete text of the reservation is published in United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1272, p. 456.

[4] Upon accession, the Government of Bangladesh made the following reservation:

"The Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh does not consider as binding upon itself the provisions of articles 2, 13 (a) and 16 (1) *(c)* and *(f)* as they conflict with *Sharia* law based on Holy Quran and Sunna."

On 23 July 1997, the Government of Bangladesh notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation relating to articles 13 *(a)* and 16 (1) *(f)* made upon accession.

The complete text of the reservation is published in United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1379, p. 336.

[5] In communications received on 14 September 1998 and 8 July 2002, the Government of Belgium informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to wihdraw its reservations made upon ratification with respect to articles 7 and 15, paragraphs 2 and 3, respectively. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1402, p. 376.

[6] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 17 July 1980 and 26 February 1982, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] Upon signature and ratification, the Government of Brazil made, and confirmed, respectively, the following reservation:

"The Government of the Federative Republic of Brazil hereby expresses its reservations to article 15, paragraph 4 and to article 16, paragraphs 1 (a), (c), (g) and (h) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

"Furthermore, Brazil does not consider itself bound by article 29, paragraph 1, of the above-mentioned Convention."

On 20 December 1994, the Government of Brazil notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the following reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The Government of the Federative Republic of Brazil hereby expresses its reservations to article 15, paragraph 4 and to article 16, paragraphs 1 (a), (c), (g) and (h) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

The complete text of the reservation is published in United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1249, p. 121.

[8] On 24 June 1992, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 29 (1) of the Convention, made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification. For the text of the said reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1249, p. 121.

[9] The Secretary-General received several objections to the signature of the above Convention by Democratic Kampuchea. These objections are identical in matter, *mutatis mutandis* , as those reproduced in note 3 in chapter IV.3 regarding Democratic Kampuchea. Following is the list of States who have notified their objection with the date of receipt of the notifications:

Participant	***Date of receipt***		
German Democratic Republic	11	Dec	1980
Hungary	19	Jan	1981
Bulgaria	29	Jan	1981
Russian Federation	13	Feb	1981

Participant	*Date of receipt*		
Belarus	18	Feb	1981
Czechoslovakia	10	Mar	1981

[10] Although Democratic Kampuchea had signed both [the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights] on 17 October 1980 (see note 3 in this chapter), the Government of Cambodia deposited an instrument of accession to the said Covenants.

[11] On 28 May 1992, the Government of Canada notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw the declaration to article 11 (1) (d) of the Convention, made upon ratification. For the text of the said declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1257, p. 496.

[12] On 27 April 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General that the Convention would apply to Macao.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Macao from Portugal and China (see note 1 under Portugal and note 3 under China regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.) Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with the reservation made by China will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[13] On 10 June 1997, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from the Governments of China and the United Kingdom (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with the reservation made by China will also apply to the Hong Kong special Administrative Region.

In addition, the notification made by the Government of China contained the following declarations:

1. ...

2. The Government of the People's Republic of China understands, on behalf of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, the main purpose of the Convention, in the light of the definition contained in article 1, to be the reduction, in accordance with its terms, of discrimination against women, and does not therefore regard the Convention as imposing any requirement upon the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region to repeal or modify any of its existing laws, regulations, customs or practices which provide for women to be treated more favourably than men, whether temporarily or in the longer term. Undertakings by the Government of the People's Republic of China on behalf of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region under article 4, paragraph 1, and other provisions of the Convention are to be construed accordingly.

3. The Government of the People's Republic of China reserves, for the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, the right to continue to apply relevant immigration legislation governing the entry into, stay in and departure from the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region as may be deemed necessary from time to time. Accordingly, acceptance of article 15, paragraph 4, and of the other provisions of the Convention is subject to the provisions of any such legislation ass not at the time having the right under the laws of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region to enter and remain in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

4. The Government of the People's Republic of China understands, in the light of the definition contained in article 1, that none of its obligations under the Convention shall be treated as extending to the affairs of religious denominations or orders in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

5. Laws applicable in the New Territories of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region which enable male indigenous villagers to exercise certain rights in respect of property and which provide for rent concessions in respect of land or property held by indigenous persons or their lawful successors through the male line will continue to [be] applied.

6. The Government of the People's Republic of China reserves, for the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, the right to apply all its legislation and the rules of pension schemes affecting retirement pensions, survivors' benefits in relation to death or retirement (including retirement on ground of redundancy), whether or not derived from a social security scheme.

This reservation will apply to any future legislation which may modify or replace such aforesaid legislation, or the rules of pension schemes, on the understanding that the terms of such legislation will be compatible with the Government of the People's Republic of China's obligations under the Convention in respect of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

The Government of the People's Republic of China reserves the right for the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region to apply any non-discriminatory requirement for a qualifying period of employment for the application of the provisions contained in article 11, paragraph 2 of the Convention.

7. The Government of the People's Republic of China understands, on behalf of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, the intention of article 15, paragraph 3, of the Convention to be that only those terms or elements of the contract or other private instrument which are discriminatory in the sense described are to be deemed null and void, but not necessarily the contract or instrument as a whole.

[14] On 30 July 2007, the Government of Cook Islands notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservations made upon accession to the Convention. The text of the reservations reads as follows: "The Government of the Cook Islands reserves the right not to apply the provisions of Article 11 (2) (b). The Government of the Cook Islands reserves the right not to apply the provisions of the Convention in so far as they are inconsistent with policies relating to recruitment into or service in: (a) The armed forces which reflect either directly or indirectly the fact that members of such forces are required to serve on armed forces aircraft or vessels and in situations involving armed combat; or (b) The law enforcement forces which reflect either directly or indirectly the fact that members of such forces are required to serve in situations involving violence or threat of violence. The

Government of the Cook Islands reserves the right not to apply Article 2 (f) and Article 5 (a) to the extent that the customs governing the inheritance of certain Cook Islands chiefly titles may be inconsistent with those provisions."

[15] On 28 June 2000, the Government of Cyprus informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation to article 9 (2) made upon accession. The text of the reservation reads as follows:

"The Government of the Republic of Cyprus wishes to enter a reservation concerning the granting to women of equal rights with men with respect to the nationality of their children, mentioned in article 9, paragraph 2 of the Convention. This reservation is to be withdrawn upon amendment of the relevant law."

[16] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 17 July 1980 and 16 February 1982, respectively, with a reservation. Subsequently, on 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1249, p 123. See also note 1 under “Czech Republic” and note 1 under “Slovakia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[17] With regard to the reservations made by the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea upon accession, the Secretary-General received the following communication from the State indicated hereinafter:

Ireland (2 April 2002):

"The Government of Ireland has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to paragraph (f) of article 2 of article 9 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, at the time of its accession thereto.

The Government of Ireland recalls that by acceding to the Convention, a State commits itself to adopt the measures required for the elimination of discrimination, in all its forms and manifestations, against women.

The Government of Ireland notes that the reservation to paragraph (f) of article 2 aims at excluding the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from the obligation to adopt necessary measures, including those of a legislative character, to eliminate any form of discrimination against women. This provision touches upon a key element for the effective elimination of discrimination against women.

The Government of Ireland further notes that the reservation to paragraph 2 of article 9 of the Convention aims to exclude an obligation of non-discrimination, which is the object of the Convention.

The Government of Ireland considers that the obligations contained in paragraph (f) of article 2 and paragraph 2 of article 9 are so central to the aims of the Convention as to render the aforesaid reservations contrary to its object and purpose.

The Government of Ireland recalls that. In accordance with paragraph 2 of article 28 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Ireland therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against WomenThis objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Ireland and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea."

[18] On 26 June 1998, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Denmark the following communciation with regard to the reservation made by Lebanon upon accession in respect of article 9, paragraph 2, and article 16, paragraph 1 c), d), f) and g). in as much as the last paragraph deals with the right to choose a family name:

The Government of Denmark is of the view that the reservations made by the Government of Lebanon raise doubts as to the commitment of Lebanon to the object and purpose of the Convention and would recall that, according to article 28, paragraph 2 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the present Convention shall not be permitted. For this reason, the Government of Denmark objects to the said reservations made by the Government of Lebanon.

The Government of Denmark recommends the Government of Lebanon to reconsider their reservations to [the Covenant].

[19] On 4 January 2008, the Government of Egypt notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation to article 9 (2) made upon ratification. The reservation reads as follows:

..., concerning the granting to women of equal rights with men with respect to the nationality of their children, without prejudice to the acquisition by a child born of a marriage of the nationality of his father. This is in order to prevent a child's acquisition of two nationalities where his parents are of different nationalities, since this may be prejudicial to his future. It is clear that the child's acquisition of his father's nationality is the procedure most suitable for the child and that this does not infringe upon the principle of equality between men and women, since it is customary for a woman to agree, upon marrying an alien, that her children shall be of the father's nationality.

[20] On 24 January 2000, the Government of Fiji notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its “reservations on articles 5 (a) and 9 of the Convention.” made upon accession.

[21] Upon ratification, the Government of France had also made the following reservations:

Articles 5 (b) and 16 (1 (d)

1. The Government of the French Republic declares that article 5 (b) and article 16, paragraph 1 (d), must not be interpreted as implying joint exercise of parental authority in situations in which French legislation allows of such excercise by only one parent.

2. The Government of the French Republic declares that aritcle 16, paragraph 1 (d), of the Convention must not preclude the application of article 383 of the Civil Code.

Article 7

The Government of the French Republic declares that article 7 must not preclude the application of the second paragraph of article LO 128 of the electoral code.

Articles 15 (2) and (3) and 16, 1 (c) and (h)

The Government of the French Republic declares that article 15, paragraphs 2 and 3, and article 16, paragraphs 1 (c) and 1 (h), of the Convention must not preclude the application of the provisions of Book Three, part V, chapter II, of the Civil Code.

In a notification received on 26 March 1984, the Government of France informed the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 7 of the Convention made upon ratification. The notification specified that the withdrawal was effected because Organic Law No. 83-1096 of 20 December 1983 has abrogated article LO 128 of the electoral code relating to temporary disqualifications of persons who have obtained French nationality.

Subsequently, in a notification received on 21 July 1986, the Government of France informed the Secretary-General that it decided to withdraw its reservation relating to article 15, paragraphs 2 and 3, and article 16, paragraphs 1 (c), (d) and (h) of the Convention, made upon ratification. The notification specified that the withdrawal was effected because the existing discriminatory provisions, against women, in the rules governing property rights arising out of matrimonial relationship and in those concerning the legal administration of the property of children were abrogated by Act No. 85-1372 of 23 December 1985 concerning equality of spouses in respect of property rights arising out of a matrimonial relationship and equality of parents in respect of the property of minor children, which entered into force on 1 July 1986.

Further, on 22 December 2003, the Government of France informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to lift its reservation relating to articles 5(b) and 16 1(d) made upon ratification.

The complete text of the reservations is published in United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1343, p. 370.

[22] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 25 June 1980 and 9 July 1980, respectively. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1249, p. 128. See also note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[23] Upon ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany made the following declaration and reservation in respect of article 7 (b):

The Federal Republic of Germany declares in respect of the paragraph of the Preamble to the Convention starting with the words “affirming that the strengthening of international peace and security”:

The right of peoples to self-determination, as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and in the International Covenants of 16 December 1966, applies to all peoples and not only to those living 'under alien and colonial domination and foreign occupation’. All peoples thus have the inalienable right freely to determine their political satus and freely to pursue their economic, social and cultural development. The Federal Republic of Germany would be unable to recognize as legally valid an interpretation of the right to self-determination which contradicts the unequivocal wording of the Charter of the United Nations and of the two International Covenants of 16 December 1966 on Civil and Political Rights and on Economic, Social and Cultural rights. It will interpret the 11th paragraph of the Preamble accordingly.

Reservation

Article 7(b) will not be applied to the extent that it contradicts the second sentence of Article 12 *a* (4) of the Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany. Pursuant to this provision of the Constitution, women may on no acount render service involving the use of arms.

On 10 December 2001, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation to article 7 (b) made upon ratification.

The complete text of the reservation is published in United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1402, p. 378.

[24] See note 1 under “Germany” regarding Berlin (West) in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[25] An instrument of accession had been deposited on 14 March 1980 with the Secretary-General. The signature was affixed on 17 July 1980 and was accompanied by the following declaration:

The People's Revolutionary Republic of Guinea wishes to sign the Convention . . . with the understanding that this procedure annuls the procedure of accession previously followed by Guinea with respect to the Convention.

[26] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation in respect of article 29 (1) made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1249, p. 129.

[27] Upon accession, the Government of Ireland also made the following reservations:

“ *Article 9 (1)*

Pending the proposed amendment to the law relating to citizenship, which is at an advance stage, Ireland reserves the right to retain the provisions in its existing law concerning the acquisition of citizenship on marriage.

Articles 13 (b) and (c)

The question of supplementing the guarantee of equality contained in the Irish Constitution which special legislation governing access to financial credit and other services and recreational activities, where these are provided by private persons, organisations or enterprises is under consideration. For the time being Ireland reserves the right to regard its existing law and measures in this area as appropriate for the attainment in Ireland of the objectives of the Convention.

Article 15

With regard to paragraph 3 of this article, Ireland reserves the right not to supplement the existing provisions in Irish law which accord women a legal capacity identical to that of men with further legislation governing the validity of any contract or other private instrument freely entered into by a woman.

With regard to paragraph 4 of this article, Ireland observes the equal rights of women relating to the movement of persons and the freedom to choose their residence; pending the proposed amendment of the law of domicile, which is at an advnace stage, it reserves the right to retain its existing law.

Articles 11 (1) and 13 (a)

Ireland reserves the right to regard the Anti-Discrimination (Pay) Act, 1974 and the Employment Equality Act 1977 and other measures taken in implementation of the European Economic Community standards concerning employment opportunities and pay as sufficient implementation of articles 11,1 (b), (c) and (d).

Ireland reserves the right for the time being to maintain provisions of Irish legislation in the area of social security which are more favourable to women than men and, pending t coming into force of the Social Welfare (Amendment) (No. 2) Act, 1985, to apply special conditions to the entitlement of married women to certain social security schemes."

On 19 December 1986, the Government of Ireland notified the Secretary-General that "following the enactment of the Irish Nationality and Citizenship Act 1986, and the Domicile and Recognition of Foreign Divorces Act 1986, it has been decided to withdraw certain reservations which had been made upon accession and relating to articles 9 (1) and 15 (4) of the Convention. Following the coming into force of the Social Welfare (Amendment) (No. 2) Act 1985, it has also been decided to withdraw the reservation contained in the concluding words in the text of Ireland's reservation to Article (11) (1) and 13 (a), that is: 'and pending the coming into force of the Social Welfare (No. 2) Act 1985, to apply special conditions to the entitlement of married women to certain social security schemes' ".

Further, on 24 March 2000, the Government of Ireland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation made to article 15 (3) made upon accession.

Subsequently, on 11 June 2004, the Government of Ireland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation to articles 13(b) and (c) made upon accession which reads as follows:

"The question of supplementing the guarantee of equality contained in the Irish Constitution which special legislation governing access to financial credit and other services and recreational activities, where these are provided by private persons, organisations or enterprises is under consideration. For the time being Ireland reserves the right to regard its existing law and measures in this area as appropriate for the attainment in Ireland of the objectives of the Convention."

The complete text of the reservations is published in United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1413, p. 415.

[28] On 12 December 1986, the Secretary General received from the Government of Israel the following objection:

. . . In the view of the Government of the State of Israel, such declaration which is explicitly of a political character is incompatible with the purposes and objectives of the Convention and cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Iraq under general international law or under particular conventions.

The Government of the State of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards Iraq an attitude of complete reciprocity.

[29] Upon ratification, the Government of Jamaica made the following reservations:

"The Government of Jamaica does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 9, paragraph 2, of the Convention."

"The Government of Jamaica delcares that it does not consider itself bound by the provions of Article 29, paragraph 1, of the Convention."

On 8 September 1995, the Government of Jamaica notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw its reservation with respect to article 9 (2) which it had made upon ratification.

The complete text of the reservations is published in United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1374, p. 439.

[30] The Government of Kuwait informed the Secretary-General, by a notification recieved on 9 December 2005, of its decision to withdraw the following reservation in respect of article 7 (a), made upon accession to the Convention, which read as follows:

The Government of Kuwait enters a reservation regarding article 7 (a), inasmuch as the provision contained in that paragraph conflicts with the Kuwaiti Electoral Act, under which the right to be eligible for election and to vote is restricted to males.

It is recalled that, on 12 February 1997, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Denmark the following communication with regard to reservations made by Kuwait upon ratification:

"The Government of Denmark finds that the said reservations are covering central provisions of the Convention. Furthermore it is a general principle of international law that internal law may not be invoked as justification for failure to perform treaty obligations. The Government of Denmark finds that the reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and accordingly inadmissible and without effect under international law. Consequently, the Government of Denmark objects to these reservations.

It is the opinion of the Government of Denmark that no time limit applies to objections against reservations, which are inadmissible under international law.

The Convention remains in force in its entirety between Kuwait and Denmark.

The Government of Denmark recommends the Government of Kuwait to reconsider its reservations to the [said] Convention."

On that same date, the Secretary-General also received from the Government of Denmark, communications, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis* , as the one made for Kuwait, with regard to reservations made by Lesotho and Malaysia, Maldives, and Singapore made upon accession, as well as on 23 March 1998, in regard to the resertions made by Pakistan upon ratification.

[31] On 25 August 2004, the Government of Lesotho informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to modify its reservation. The original reservation made upon ratification reads as follows:

"The Government of the Kingdom of Lesotho declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 2 to the extent that it conflicts with Lesotho's constitutional stipulations relative to succession to the throne of the Kingdom of Lesotho and law relating to succession to chieftainship. The Lesotho Government's ratification is subject to the understanding that none of its obligations under the Convention especially in article 2 (e), shall be treated as extending to the affairs of religious denominations. Furthermore, the Lesotho Government declares it shall not take any legislative measures under the Convention where those measures would be incompatible with the Constitution of Lesotho."

[32] On 5 July 1995, the Government of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Republic notified the Secretary-General of the "new formulation of its reservation to the Convention, which replaces the formulation contained in the instrument of accession" which read as follows:

[Accession] is subject to the general reservation that such accession cannot conflict with the laws on personal status derived from the Islamic *Shariah* .

[33] Upon accession, the Government of Liechtenstein made the following reservations:

Reservation concerning article 1

"In the light of the definition given in article 1 of the Convention, the Principality of Liechtenstein reserves the right to apply, with respect to all the obligations of the Convention, article 3 of the Liechtenstein Constitution."

Reservation concerning article 9 (2)

The Principality of Liechtenstein reserves the right to apply the Liechtenstein legislation according to which Liechtenstein nationality is granted under certain conditions."

On 3 October 1996, the Government of Liechtenstein notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation to article 9 (2) made upon accession which reads as follows:

The Principality of Liechtenstein reserves the right to apply the Liechtenstein legislation according to which Liechtenstein nationality is granted under certain conditions."

The complete text of the reservation is published in United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1936, p. 407.

[34] On 24 October 1991, the Government of Malawi notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the following reservations made upon accession:

"Owing to the deep-rooted nature of some traditional customs and practices of Malawians, the Government of the Republic of Malawi shall not, for the time being, consider itself bound by such of the provisions of the Convention as require immediate eradication of such traditional customs and practices.

"While the Government of the Republic of Malawi accepts the principles of article 29, paragraph 2 of the Convention this acceptance should nonetheless be read in conjunction with [its] declaration of 12th December 1966, concerning the recognition, by the Government of the Republic of Malawi, as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Justice under article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the Court."

In respect of the first reservation, the Secretary-General had received, on 5 August 1987, from the Government of Mexico the following communication:

The Government of the United Mexican States hopes that the process of eradication of traditional customs and practices referred to in the first reservation of the Republic of Malawi will not be so protracted as to impair fulfillment of the purpose and intent of the Convention.

[35] On 6 February 1998, the Government of Malaysia notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to modify its reservation made upon accession as follows:

With respect to article 5 (a) of the Convention, the Government of Malaysia declares that the provision is subject to the *Syariah* law on the division of inherited property.

With respect to article 7 (b) of the Convention, the Government of Malaysia declares that the application of said article 7 (b) shall not affect appointment to certain public offices like the Mufti *Syariah* Court Judges, and the Imam which is in accordance with the provisions of the Islamic Shariah law.

With respect to article 9, paragraph 2 of the Convention, the Government of Malaysia declares that its reservation will be reviewed if the Government amends the relevant law.

With respect to article 16.1 (a) and paragraph 2, the Government of Malaysia declares that under the Syariah law and the laws of Malaysia the age limit for marriage for women is sixteen and men is eighteen."

In keeping with the depositary practice followed in similar cases, the Secretary-General proposed to receive the modification in question for deposit in the absence of any objection on the part of any of the Contracting States, either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged, within a period of 90 days from the date of its notification (21 April 1998), that is to say, on 20 July 1998.

In this regard, on the dates indicated below, the Secretary-General received from the Governments of France and the Netherlands the following communcations relating to the said partial withdrawal.

France (20 July 1998:)

France considers that the reservation made by Malaysia, as expressed in the partial withdrawal and modifications made by Malaysia on 6 February 1998, is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. France therefore objects to the [reservation].

This objection shall not otherwise affect the entry into force of the Convention between France and Malaysia.

Netherlands (21 July 1998):

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the modfication of the reservations made by Malaysia to article 5(a) and 16.1. (a) and paragraph 2 of the [Convention].

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands acknowledges that Malaysia has specified these reservations, made at the time of its accession to the Convention. Nevertheless the Govenrment of the Kingdom of the Nethelrands wishes to declare that it assumes that Malaysia will ensure implementation of the rights enshrined in the above articles and will strive to bring its relevant national legislation into conformity with the obligations imposed by the Convention. This declaration shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Malaysia."

Consequently, the modification in question is not accepted, the Government of France having objected thereto.

[36] On 29 January 1999, the Government of Maldives notified the Secretary-General of a modification of its reservation made upon accession. In keeping with the depositary practice followed in similar cases, the Secretary-General proposed to receive the modification in question for deposit in the absence of any objection on the part of any of the contracting States, either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged, within a period of 90 days from the date of its notification (i.e. 25 March 1999). No objection having been received, the modification was accepted for deposit upon the expiration of the 90 day period, that is to say on 23 June 1999. The text of the reservations made upon accession read as follows:

Reservations:

"The Government of the Republic of Maldives will comply with the provisions of the Convention, except those which the Government may consider contradictory to the principles of the Islamic Sharia upon which the laws and traditions of the Maldives is founded.

Furthermore, the Republic of Maldives does not see itself bound by any provisions of the Convention which obliges to change its Constitution and laws in any manner."

In this regard, the Secretary-General received communications from various States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Finland (17 August 1999):

"The Government of Finland objected in 1994 to the reservations made by the Government of Maldives upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. The Government of Finland has now examined the contents of the modified reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Maldives to the said Convention.

The Government of Finland welcomes with satisfaction that the Government of the Republic of Maldives has specified the reservations made at the time of its accession to the Convention. However, the reservations to Article 7 (a) and Article 16 still include elements which are objectionable. The Government of Finland therefore wishes to declare that it assumes that the Government of the Republic of Maldives will ensure the implementation of the rights recognised in the Convention and will do its utmost to bring its national legislation into compliance with obligations under the Convention with a view to withdrawing the reservation. This declaration does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Maldives and Finland".

Germany (16 August 1999):

The modification does not constitute a withdrawal or a partial withdrawal of the original reservations to the Convention by the Republic of the Maldives. Instead the modification constitutes a new reservation to articles 7 a (right of women to vote in all elections and public referenda and be eligible for elections to all publicly elected bodies) and 16 (elimination of discrimination against women in all matters relating to marriage and family relations) of the Convention extending and reinforcing the original reservations.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany notes that reservations to treaties can only be made by a State when signing, ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to a treaty (article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties). After a State has bound itself to a treaty under international law it can no longer submit new reservations or extend or add to old reservations. It is only possible to totally or partially withdraw original reservations, something unfortunately not done by the Government of the Republic of the Maldives with its modification.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany objects to the modification of the reservations".

[37] With regard to the reservation made by Mauritania upon accession, the Secretary-General received communications from the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Ireland (13 June 2002):

"The Government of Ireland [has] examined the reservation made by Mauritania upon its accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination against Women.

The Government of Ireland [is] of the view that a reservation which consists of a general reference to religious law and to the Constitution of the reserving State and which does not clearly specify the provisions of the Convention to which it applies and the extent of the derogation therefrom, may cast doubts on the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. The Government of Ireland [is] furthermore of the view that such a general reservation may undermine the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of Ireland [recalls] that article 28, paragraph 2 of the Convention provides that a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Ireland therefore [objects] to the reservation made by Mauritania to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Ireland and Mauritania."

France (17 June 2002):

The Government of the French Republic has examined the reservation made by the Government of Mauritania upon accession to the Convention of 18 December 1979 on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. By stating that it approves the Convention in each and every one of its parts which are not contrary to Islamic Sharia and to its Constitution, the Government of Mauritania formulates a reservation of general, indeterminate scope that gives the other States parties no idea which provisions of the Convention are currently affected by the reservation or might be affected in future. The Government of the French Republic considers that the reservation could make the provisions of the Convention ineffective and objects to it.

[38] In a communication received on 5 May 1998, the Government of Mauritius informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservations with regard to subparagraphs (b) and (d) of paragraph 1 of article 11 and subparagraph (g) of paragraph 1 of article 16 made upon accession. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1361, p. 356.

[39] In a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation, made upon ratification with respect to article 29 (1). For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1249, p. 131.

[40] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[41] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

[42] On 13 January 1989, the Secretary-General received from the Government of New Zealand, a communication notifying him that, after consultation with the Government of the Cook Islands and the Government of Niue, it denounced the Convention concerning the employment of women on underground work in mines of all kinds (ILO Convention No. 45) on 23 June 1987 and that in accordance with article 28 (3) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, it withdraws the reservation made upon ratification which reads as follows:

"The Government of New Zealand, the Government of the Cook Islands and the Government of Niue reserve the right, to the extent the Convention is inconsistent with the provisions of the Convention concerning the Employment of Women on Underground Work in Mines of all Kinds (ILO Convention No. 45) which was ratified by the Government of New Zealand on 29 March 1938, to apply the provisions of the latter."

See also note 1 under “Cook Islands” and note 1 under “Niue” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[43] On 5 July 2007, the Government of New Zealand informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon ratification in accordance with article 28 (1) of the Convention which read as follows: ... the Government of New Zealand, the Government of the Cook Islands and the Government of Niue reserved the right not to apply the provisions of CEDAW in so far as they are inconsistent with policies relating to recruitment into for service in: (a) the Armed Forces which reflect either directly or indirectly the fact that members of such forces are required to serve on armed forces aircraft or vessels and in situations involving armed combat; or (b) the law enforcement forces which reflect either directly or indirectly the fact that members of such forces are required to serve in situations involving violence or threat of violence, in their territories; ... NOW THEREFORE the Government of New Zealand, having considered the said reservation, HEREBY WITHDRAWS the said reservation in respect of the metropolitan territory of New Zealand pursuant to paragraph 3 of article 28 of CEDAW; ... AND DECLARES that, consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand to the development of self-government for Tokelau, ther having been consultations regarding CEDAW between the Government of New Zealand and the Government of Tokelau; the withdrawal of the said reservation shall also apply to Tokelau ..."

[44] On 5 September 2003, the Government of New Zealand informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation in respect only of the metropolitan territory of New Zealand. The reservation reads as follows:

“The Government of New Zealand, the Government of the Cook Islands and the Government of Niue reserve the right not to apply the provisions of article 11 (2) (b).”

Moreover, the Government of New Zealand notified the Secretary-General of the the following territorial exclusion:

"Declares that, consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand to the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, the withdrawal of this reservation shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory."

See also note 1 under “Cook Islands” and note 1 under “Niue” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[45] The instrument of ratification indicates that in accordance with the special relationships which exist between New Zealand and the Cook Islands and between New Zealand and Niue, there have been consultations regarding the Convention between the

Government of New Zealand and the Government of the Cook Islands and between the Government of New Zealand and the Government of Niue; that the Government of the Cook Islands, which has exclusive competence to implement treaties in the Cook Islands, has requested that the Convention should extend to the Cook Islands; that the Government of Niue which has exclusive competence to implement treaties in Niue, has requested that the Convention should extend to Niue. The said instrument specifies that accordingly the Convention shall apply also to the Cook Islands and Niue.

See also note 1 under "Cook Islands" and "Niue" in the Historical Information section in the front matter of this volume.

[46] See also note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[47] With regard to the reservations made by the Government of Niger upon accession, the Secretary-General received from the Governments of the following States, communications on the dates indicated hereinafter:

France (14 November 2000):

By indicating that it "expresses reservations" to article 2, paragraphs (d) and (f), article 5, paragraph (a), and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (e) and (g), the Government of the Republic of the Niger is aiming completely to preclude the application of the provisions concerned. The reservation to article 15, paragraph 4, which seeks to deprive married women of the right to choose their residence and domicile, is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The general reservation relating to the provisions of article 2, paragraphs (d) and (f), article 5, paragraphs (a) and (b), article 15, paragraph 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (e) and (g), seeks to ensure that domestic law, and even domestic practice and the current values of society, prevail in general over the provisions of the Convention. The provisions in question concern not only family relations but also social relations as a whole; in particular, article 2, paragraph (d), imposes an obligation on public authorities and institutions to comply with the ban on any act or practice of discrimination, and article 2, paragraph (f), establishes the obligation to take the appropriate measures, notably legislative measures, to prevent discrimination against women, including in relations between individuals. Because it ignores these obligations, the reservation is manifestly contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the French Republic considers that the reservations to articles 2, 5, 15 and 16 completely vitiate the undertaking of the Republic of the Niger and are manifestly not authorized by the Convention; in consequence, it enters its objection to them.

[The Permanent Mission further adds] that the reservations of the Republic of the Nige, made on 8 October 1999, were notified by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 2 November 1999 and received by the French Republic on 16 November 1999. In these circumstances, the French Republic is still able, as at this date and until 15 November 2000, to lodge an objection and the Secretary-General of the United Nations cannot treat this act as a simple communication.

Netherlands (6 December 2000):

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the view that these reservations which seek to limit the obligations of the reserving State by invoking its national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of Niger to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that according to paragraph 2 of Article 28 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the afore-said reservations made by the Government of Niger to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Niger."

[48] On 16 October 1997, the Government of Poland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with regard to article 29, paragraph 1 of the Convention made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1249, p. 13.

[49] In this regard, on 23 July 1997, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Portugal, the following communication:

"Portugal is of the view that a general declaration of the kind made by Pakistan, constituting in fact in legal terms a general reservation, and not clearly specifying the provisions of the Convention to which it applies and the extent of the derogation therefrom, contributes to undermining the basis of international law.

Furthermore, according to paragraph 2 of article 28 of the Convention, a general reservation of such a kind is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and shall not be permitted.

Portugal therefore objects to the aforesaid general reservation which will not preclude the entry into force of the Convention in its entirety between Pakistan and Portugal."

[50] Upon ratification, the Government of the Republic of Korea made the following reservations:

"The Government of the Republic of Korea, having examined the said Convention, hereby ratifies the Convention considering itself not bound by the provisions of Article 9 and sub-paragraphs (c), (d), (f) and (g) of paragraph 1 of Article 16 of the Convention."

On 15 March 1991, the Government of the Republic of Korea notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw, with effect as from that date, the reservation made upon ratification to the extent that they apply to sub-paragraphs (c), (d) and (f) of paragraph 1 of article 16.

Subsequently, on 24 August 1999, the Government of the Republic of Korea notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw, with effect as from that date, its reservation made upon ratification to article 9.

[51] On 2 April 1997, the Government of Romania notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation made with regard to article 29 of the Convention. For the text of the Convention, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1259, p. 437.

[52] In communications received on 8 March 1989, 19 and 20 April 1989, respectively, the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Ukraini- an Soviet Socialist Republic notified the Secretary-General that they had decided to withdraw the reservations made upon ratification relating to article 29 (1). The reservations were identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis* , to the reservation made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1249, pp. 117, 121 and 133.

[53] On 24 July 2007, the Government of Singapore notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the following reservation made upon accession to the Convention: "(2) Singapore is geographically one of the smallest independent countries in the world and one of the most densely populated. The Republic of Singapore accordingly reserves the right to apply such laws and conditions governing the entry into, stay in, employment of and departure from its territory of those who do not have the right under the laws of Singapore to enter and remain indefinitely in Singapore and to the conferment, acquisitions and loss of citizenship of women who have acquired such citizenship by marriage and of children born outside Singapore."

[54] On 25 October 1996, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Sweden, the following communication regarding reservations made by Malaysia upon accession:

[Same text, mutatis mutandis, as the one made under "Objections".]

[55] On 13 August 1997, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Sweden the following communication with regard to the reservation made by Singapore:

"The Government of Sweden is of the view that these general reservations raise doubts as to the commitment of Singapore to the object and purpose of the Convention and would recall that, according to article 28, paragraph 2, of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that states are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden is further of the view that general reservations of the kind made by the Government of Singapore, which do not clearly specify the provisions of the Convention to which they apply and the extent of the derogation therefrom, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid general reservations made by the Government of Singapore to the [said Convention].

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Singapore and Sweden. The Convention will thus become operative between the two states without Singapore benefiting from these reservations.

It is the opinion of the Government of Sweden, that no time limit applies to objections against reservations, which are inadmissible under international law."

On that same date, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Sweden, a communication with regard to the declaration made by Pakistan, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis* , as the one made for Singapore.

[56] On 29 April 2004, the Government of Switzerland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation in respect of article 7 (b) made upon ratification. The text of the reservation reads as follows:

(a) Reservation concerning article 7 (b):

Said provisions shall be without prejudice to Swiss military legislation prohibiting women from performing functions involving armed conflict, except in self-defence; ...

[57] Upon accession, the Government of Thailand made the following declaration and reservations:

"Declaration:

The Royal Thai Government wishes to express its understanding that the purposes of the Convention are to eliminate discrimination against women and to accord to every person, men and women alike, equality before the law, and are in accordance with the principles prescribed by the Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand.

Reservations:

1. In all matters which concern national security, maintenance of public order and service or employment in the military or paramilitary forces, the Royal Thai Government reserves its right to apply the provisions of the Convention ont the Elmination of all foms of discrimination aginst Women, in particular articles 7 and 10 , only within the limits establshed by national laws regulations and practices.

2. With regard to article 9, paragraph 2, [...] the Royal Thai Government considers that the application of the said provisions shall be subject to the limits and criteria established by national law, regulations and practices."

3. The Royal Thai Government does not consider itself bound by the provisions of [...] article 16 and article 29, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

On 25 January 1991, the Government of Thailand notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservations made upon accession to the extent that they apply to article 11, paragraph 1 (b), and article 15, paragraph 3.

Subsequently, on 26 October 1992, the Government of Thailand notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw one of the reservations made upon accession to the Convention, i.e., that relating to article 9 (2), which reservation reads as follows:

"2. With regard to article 9, paragraph 2, [...] the Royal Thai Government considers that the application of the said provisions shall be subject to the limits and criteria established by national law, regulations and practices."

Subsequently, on 1 August 1996, the Government of Thnd notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw, as from that same date, the following reservation, made upon accession:

"1. In all matters which concern national security, maintenance of public order and service or employment in the military or para military forces, the Royal Thai Government reserves its right to apply the provisions of the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women, in particular articles 7 and 10, only within the limits established by national laws, regulations and practices."

The complete text of the declaration and reservations are published in United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1404, p. 419.

[58] With regard to the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates upon accession, the Secretary-General received a communication from the following State on the date indicated hereinafter:

Denmark (14 December 2005):

"The Government of Denmark has examined the reservations made by the Government of the United Arab Emirates upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women regarding article 2 (f), 15 (2) and 16 pertaining to Shariah principles.

The Government of Denmark considers that the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates to article 2 (f), 15 (2) and 16 referring to the contents of the Shariah Law do not clearly specify the extent to which the United Arab Emirates feel committed to the object and purpose of the Convention. Consequently, the Government of Denmark considers the said reservations as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. Consequently, the Government of Denmark considers the said reservations as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and accordingly inadmissible and without effect under international law.

The Government of Denmark wishes to recall that, according to article 28 (2) of the Convention reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Denmark therefore objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the Government of the United Arab Emirates to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. This shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention in its entirety between the United Arab Emirates and Denmark.

The Government of Denmark recommends the Government of the United Arab Emirates to reconsider its reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women."

[59] Upon ratification the Government of the United Kingdom made the following declarations and reservations:

"A. On behalf of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

"(a) The United Kingdom understands the main purpose of the Convention, in the light of the definition contained in Article 1, to be the reduction, in accordance with its terms, of discrimination against women, and does not therefore regard the Convention as imposing any requirement to repeal or modify any existing laws, regulations, customs or practices which provide for women to be treated more favourably than men, whether temporarily or in the longer term; the United Kingdom's undertakings under Article 4, paragraph 1, and other provisions of the Convention are to be construed accordingly.

"(b) The United Kingdom reserves the right to regard the provisions of the Sex Discrimination Act 1975, the Employment Protection (Consolidation) Act 1978, the Employment Act 1980, the Sex Discrimination (Northern Ireland) Order 1976, the Industrial Relations (No. 2) (Northern Ireland) Order 1976, the Industrial Relations (Northern Ireland) Order 1982, the Equal Pay Act 1970 (as amended) and the Equal Pay Act (Northern Ireland) 1970 (as amended), including the exceptions and exemptions contained in any of these Acts and Orders, as constituting appropriate measures for the practical realisation of the objectives of the Convention in the social and economic circumstances of the United Kingdom, and to continue to apply these provisions accordingly; this reservation will apply equally to any future legislation which may modify or replace the above Acts and Orders on the understanding that the terms of such legislation will be compatible with the United Kingdom's obligations under the Convention.

"(c) In the light of the definition contained in Article 1, the United Kingdom's ratification is subject to the understanding that none of its obligations under the Convention shall be treated as extending to the succession to, or possession and enjoyment of, the Throne, the peerage, titles of honour, social precedence or armorial bearings, or as extending to the affairs of religious denominations or orders or to the admission into or service in the Armed Forces of the Crown.

"(d) The United Kingdom reserves the right to continue to apply such immigration legislation governing entry into, stay in, and departure from, the United Kingdom as it may deem necessary from time to time and, accordingly, its acceptance of Article 15 (4) and of the other provisions of the Convention is subject to the provisions of any such legislation as regards persons not at the time having the right under the law of the United Kingdom to enter and remain in the United Kingdom.

"Article 1

With reference to the provisions of the Sex Discrimination Act 1975 and other applicable legislation, the United Kingdom's acceptance of Article 1 is subject to the reservation that the phrase "irrespective of their marital status" shall not be taken to render discriminatory any difference of treatment accorded to single persons as against married persons, so long as there is equality of treatment as between married men and married women and as between single men and single women.

"Article 2

In the light of the substantial progress already achieved in the United Kingdom in promoting the progressive elimination of discrimination against women, the United Kingdom reserves the right, without prejudice to the other reservations made by the United Kingdom, to give effect to paragraphs (f) and (g) by keeping under review such of its laws and regulations as may still embody significant differences in treatment between men and women with a view to making changes to those laws and regulations when to do so would be compatible with essential and overriding considerations of economic policy. In relation to forms of discrimination more precisely prohibited by other provisions of the Convention, the obligations under this Article must (in the case of the United Kingdom) be read in conjunction with the other reservations and declarations made in respect of those provisions including the declarations and reservations of the United Kingdom contained in paragraphs (a) - (d) above.

"With regard to paragraphs (f) and (g) of this Article the United Kingdom reserves the right to continue to apply its law relating to sexual offences and prostitution; this reservation will apply equally to any future law which may modify or replace it.

"Article 9

The British Nationality Act 1981, which was brought into force with effect from January 1983, is based on principles which do not allow of any discrimination against women within the meaning of Article 1 as regards acquisition, change or retention of their nationality or as regards the nationality of their children. The United Kingdom's acceptance of Article 9 shall not, how ever, be taken to invalidate the continuation of certain temporary or transitional provisions which will continue in force beyond that date.

"The United Kingdom reserves the right to take such steps as may be necessary to comply with its obligations under Article 2 of the First Protocol to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms signed at Paris on 20 March 1952 and its obligations under paragraph 3 of Article 13 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights opened for signature at New York on 19 December 1966, to the extent that the said provisions preserve the freedom of parental choice in respect of the education of children; and reserves also the right not to take any measures which may conflict with its obligation under paragraph 4 of Article 13 of the said Covenant not to interfere with the liberty of individuals and bodies to establish and direct educational institutions, subject to the observation of certain principles and standards.

Moreover, the United Kingdom can only accept the obligations under paragraph (c) of Article 10 within the limits of the statutory powers of central Government, in the light of the fact that the teaching curriculum, the provision of textbooks and teaching methods are reserved for local control and are not subject to central Government direction; moreover, the acceptance of the objective of encouraging coeducation is without prejudice to the right of the United Kingdom also to encourage other types of education.

"Article 11

The United Kingdom interprets the "right to work" referred to in paragraph 1 (a) as a reference to the "right to work" as defined in other human rights instruments to which the United Kingdom is a party, notably Article 6 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of 19 December 1966.

"The United Kingdom interprets paragraph 1 of Article 11, in the light of the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 4, as not precluding prohibitions, restrictions or conditions on the employment of women in certain areas, or on the work done by them, where this is considered necessary or desirable to protect the health and safety of women or the human foetus, including such prohibitions, restrictions or conditions imposed in consequence of other international obligations of the United Kingdom; The United Kingdom declare that, in the event of a conflict between obligations under the prsent Convention and its obligations under the Convention concerning teh emplyoment of wmeon on underground work in mines of all kinds (ILO Convention No. 45), the proviisions of the last mentioned Convention shall prevail.

"The United Kingdom reserves the right to apply all United Kingdom legislation and the rules of pension schemes affecting retirement pensions, survivors' benefits and other benefits in relation to death or retirement (including retirement on grounds of redundancy), whether or not derived from a Social Security scheme.

"This reservation will apply equally to any future legislation which may modify or replace such legislation, or the rules of pension schemes, on the understanding that the terms of such legislation will be compatible with the United Kingdom's obligations under the Convention.

"The United Kingdom reserves the right to apply the following provisions of United Kingdom legislation concerning the benefits specified:

a) social security benefits for persons engaged in caring for a severely disabled person under section 37 of the Social Security Act 1975 and section 37 of the Social Security (Northern Ireland) Act 1975;

b) increases of benefits for adult dependants under sections 44 to 47, 49 and 66 of the Social Security Act 1975 and under sections 44 to 47, 49 and 66 of the Social Security (Northern Ireland) Act 1975;

c) retirement pensions and survivors' benefits under the Social Security Acts 1975 to 1982 and the Social Security (Northern Ireland) Acts 1975 to 1982;

d) family income supplements under the Family Income Supplements Act 1970 and the Family Income Supplements Act (Northern Ireland) 1971.

"This reservation will apply equally to any future legislation which may modify or replace any of the provisions specified in sub-paragraphs (a) to (d) above, on the understanding that the terms of such legislation will be compatible with the United Kingdom's ob ligations under the Convention.

The United Kingdom reserves the right to apply any non-discriminatory requirement for a qualifying period of employment or insurance for the application of the provisions contained in Article 11 (2).

"Article 13

The United Kingdom reserves the right, notwithstanding the obligations undertaken in Article 13, or any other relevant article of the Convention, to continue to apply the income tax and capital gains tax legislation which:

i) Deems for income tax purposes the income of a married woman living with her husband in a year, or part of a year, of assessment to be her husband's income and not to be her income (subject to the right ofe husband and the wife to elect jointly that the wife's earned income shall be charged to income tax as if she were a single woman with no other income); and

ii) Requires tax in respect of such income and of chargeable gains accruing to such a married woman to be assessed on her husband (subject to the right of either of them to apply for separate assessment) and consequently (if no such application is made) restricts to her husband the right to appeal against any such assessment and to be heard or to be represented at the hearing of any such appeal; and

iii) Entitles a man who has his wife living with him, or whose wife is wholly maintained by him, during the year of assessment to a deduction from his total income of an amount larger than that to which an individual in any other case is entitled and entitles an individual whose total income includes any earned income of his wife to have that deduction increased by the amount of that earned income or by an amount specified in the legislation whichever is the less.

"Article 15

"In relation to Article 15, paragraph 2, the United Kingdom understands the term 'legal capacity' as referring merely to the existence of a separate and distinct legal personality.

"In relation to Article 15, paragraph 3, the United Kingdom understands the intention of this provision to be that only those terms or elements of a contract or other private instrument which are discriminatory in the sense described are to be deemed null and void, but not necessarily the contract or instrument as a whole.

"Article 16

As regards sub-paragraph 1 (f) of Article 16, the United Kingdom does not regard the reference to the paramountcy of the interests of the children as being directly relevant to the elimination of discrimination against women, and declares in this connection that the legislation of the United Kingdom regulating adoption, while giving a principal position to the promotion of the children's welfare, does not give to the child'snterests the same paramount place as in issues concerning custody over children.

"The United Kingdom' acceptance of paragraph 1 of Article 16 shall not be treated as either limiting the freedom of a person to dispose of his property as he wishes or as giving a person a right to property the subject of such limitation.

"B. *On behalf of the Isle of Man, the British Virgin Islands, the Falkland Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, and the Turks and Caicos Islands:*

[Same reservations as the one made on behalf of the United Kingdom under paragraphs A (a), (c), and (d) except that in the of case d) it applies to the territories and their laws).]

Article 1

[Same reservation as the one made in respect of the United Kingdom except with regard to the absence of a reference to United Kingdom legislation.]

Article 2

[Same reservation as the one made in respect of the United Kingdom except that reference is made to the laws of the territories, and not the laws of the United Kingdom.]

Article 9

[Same reservation as the one made in respect of the United Kingdom.]

Article 11

[Same reservation as those made in respect of the United Kingdom except that a reference is made to the laws of the territories, and not to the laws of the United Kingdom.]

"Also, as far as the territories are concerned, the specific benefits listed and which may be applied under the provisions of these territories' legislation are as follows:

a) social security benefits for persons engaged in caring for a severely disabled person;

b) increases of benefit for adult dependants;

c) retirement pensions and survivors' benefits;

d) family income supplements.

"This reservation will apply equally to any future legislation which may modify or replace any of the provisions specified in sub-paragraphs (a) to (d) above, on the understanding that the terms of such legislation will be compatible with the United Kinom's obligations under the Convention.

"The United Kingdom reserves the right to apply any non-discriminatory requirement for a qualifying period of employment or insurance for the application of the provisions contained in Article 11 (2).

Article 13, 15 and 16

[Same reservations as those made on behalf the United Kingdom.]

On 4 January 1995, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the following declaration and reservation made upon ratification:

Declaration:

"... the United Kingdom declares that, in the event of a conflict between obligations under the present Convention and its obligations under the Convention concerning the employment of women on underground work in mines of all kinds (ILO Convention No. 45), the provisions of the last mentioned Convention shall prevail."

Reservation:

"Article 13

The United Kingdom reserves the right, notwithstanding the obligations undertaken in Article 13, or any other relevant article of the Convention, to continue to apply the income tax and capital gains tax legislation which:

i) deems for income tax purposes the income of a married woman living with her husband in a year, or part of a year, of assessment to be her husband's income and not to be her income (subject to the right of the husband and the wife to elect jointly that the wife's earned income shall be charged to income tax as if she were a single woman with no other income); and

ii) requires tax in respect of such income and of chargeable gains accruing to such a married woman to be assessed on her husband (subject to the right of either of them to apply for separate assessment) and consequently (if no such application is made) restricts to her husband the right to appeal against any such assessment and to be heard or to be represented at the hearing of any such appeal; and

iii) entitles a man who has his wife living with himor whose wife is wholly maintained by him, during the year of assessment to a deduction from his total income of an amount larger than that to which an individual in any other case is entitled and entitles an individual whose total income includes any earned income of his wife to have that deduction increased by the amount of that earned income or by an amount specified in the legislation whichever is the less.

Further, on 22 March 1996, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the following reservations and declarations made upon ratification:

"(b) The United Kingdom reserves the right to regard the provisions of the Sex Discrimination Act 1975, the Employment Protection (Consolidation) Act 1978, the Employment Act 1980, the Sex Discrimination (Northern Ireland) Order 1976, the Industrial Relations (No. 2) (Northern Ireland) Order 1976, the Industrial Relations (Northern Ireland) Order 1982, the Equal Pay Act 1970 (as amended) and the Equal Pay Act (Northern Ireland) 1970 (as amended), including the exceptions and exemptions contained in any of these Acts and Orders, as constituting appropriate measures for the practical realisation of the objectives of the Convention in the social and economic circumstances of the United Kingdom, and to continue to apply these provisions accordingly; this reservation will apply equally to any future legislation which may modify or replace the above Acts and Orders on the understanding that the terms of such legislation will be compatible with the United Kingdom's obligations under the Convention."

"Article 1

With reference to the provisions of the Sex Discrimination Act 1975 and other applicable legislation, the United Kingdom's acceptance of Article 1 is subject to the reservation that the phrase "irrespective of their marital status" shall not be taken to render discriminatory any difference of treatment accorded to single persons as against married persons, so long as there is equality of treatment as between married men and married women and as between single men and single women."

"Article 2

In the light of the substantial progress already achieved in the United Kingdom in promoting the progressive elimination of discrimination against women, the United Kingdom reserves the right, without prejudice to the other reservations made by the United Kingdom, to give effect to paragraphs (f) and (g) by keeping under review such of its laws and regulations as may still embody significant differences in treatment between men and women with a view to making changes to those laws and regulations when to do so would be compatible with essential and overriding considerations of economic policy. In relation to forms of discrimination more precisely prohibited by other provisions of the Convention, the obligations under this Article must (in the case of the United Kingdom) be read in conjunction with the other reservations and declarations made in respect of those provisions including the declarations and reservations of the United Kingdom contained in paragraphs (a) - (d) above.

"With regard to paragraphs (f) and (g) of this Article the United Kingdom reserves the right to continue to apply its law relating to sexual offences and prostitution; this reservation will apply equally to any future law which may modify or replace it."

"Article 9

.....

"The United Kingdom reserves the right to take such steps as may be necessary to comply with its obligations under Article 2 of the First Protocol to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms signed at Paris on 20 March 1952 and its obligations under paragraph 3 of Article 13 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights opened for signature at New York on 19 December 1966, to the extent that the said provisions preserve the freedom of parental choice in respect of the education of children; and reserves also the right not to take any measures which may conflict with its obligation under paragraph 4 of Article 13 of the said Covenant not to interfere with the liberty of individuals and bodies to establish and direct educational institutions, subject to the observation of certain principles and standards."

"Moreover, the United Kingdom can only accept the obligations under paragraph (c) of Article 10 within the limits of the statutory powers of central Government, in the light of the fact that the teaching curriculum, the provision of textbooks and teaching methods are reserved for local control and are not subject to central Government direction; moreover, the acceptance of the objective of encouraging coeducation is without prejudice to the right of the United Kingdom also to encourage other types of education."

"Article 11

The United Kingdom interprets the "right to work" referred to in paragraph 1 (a) as a reference to the "right to work" as defined in other human rights instruments to which the United Kingdom is a party, notably Article 6 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of 19 December 1966.

"The United Kingdom interprets paragraph 1 of Article 11, in the light of the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 4, as not precluding prohibitions, restrictions or conditions on the employment of women in certain areas, or on the work done by them, where this is considered necessary or desirable to protect the health and safety of women or the human foetus, including such prohibitions, restrictions or conditions imposed in consequence of other international obligations of the United Kingdom;

"The United Kingdom reserves the right to apply the following provisions of United Kingdom legislation concerning the benefits specified:

a) social security benefits for persons engaged in caring for a severely disabled person under section 37 of the Social Security Act 1975 and section 37 of the Social Security (Northern Ireland) Act 1975;

.....

c) retirement pensions and survivors' benefits under the Social Security Acts 1975 to 1982 and the Social Security (Northern Ireland) Acts 1975 to 1982;

d) family income supplements under the Family Income Supplements Act 1970 and the Family Income Supplements Act (Northern Ireland) 1971.

"This reservation will apply equally to any future legislation which may modify or replace any of the provisions specified in sub-paragraphs (a) to (d) above, on the understanding that the terms of such legislation will be compatible with the United Kingdom's ob ligations under the Convention."

"Article 15

In relation to Article 15, paragraph 2, the United Kingdom understands the term "legal capacity" as referring merely to the existence of a separate and distinct legal personality."

.....

"Article 16

.....

The United Kingdom's acceptance of paragraph 1 of Article 16 shall not be treated as either limiting the freedom of a person to dispose of his property as he wishes or as giving a person a right to property the subject of such a limitation."

By the same communication, the Government of the United Kingdom also informed the Secretary-General "for the avoidance of doubt, that the declarations and reservations entered in respect of the dependent territories on behalf of which the Convention was also ratified on 7 April 1986 continue to apply, but are under active review".

The complete text of the declarations and reservations are published in United Nations, *Treaty Series,* vol. 1423, p. 412.

Subsequently, on 6 June 2005, the Government of the United Kingdom notified the Secretary-General of the following:

"..... The Government of the United Kingdom wish to withdraw from paragraph A c) of that reservation the words:

"To the admission into or service in the Armed Forces of the Crown"

and to substitute the words:

"Any act done for the purpose of ensuring the combat effectiveness of the Armed Forces of the Crown."

So that Paragra A c) of the United Kingdom's reservation will then read

"In the light of the definition contained in Article 1, the United Kingdom's ratification is subject to the understanding that none of its obligations under the Convention shall be treated as extending to the succession to, or possession and enjoyment of, the Throne, the peerage, titles of honour, social precedence or armorial bearings, or as extending to the affairs of religious denominations or orders or any act done for the purpose of ensuring the combat effectiveness of the Armed Forces of the Crown."

[60] On 24 July 2007, the Government of the United Kingdom notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the following reservation made upon ratification to the Convention: "(d) The United Kingdom reserves the right to continue to apply such immigration legislation governing entry into, stay in, and departure from, the United Kingdom as it may deem necessary from time to time and, accordingly, its acceptance of Article 15 (4) and of the other provisions of the Convention is subject to the provisions of any such legislation as regards persons not at the time having the right under the law of the United Kingdom to enter and remain in the United Kingdom."

[61] The instrument of ratification specifies that the said Convention is ratified in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Isle of Man, British Virgin Islands, Falkland Islands (Malvinas), South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, and Turks and Caicos Islands.

In this connection, on 4 April 1989, the Government of Argentina made the following objection:

The Argentine Republic rejects the extension of the territorial application of the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination againts Women, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 18 December 1979, to the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, notified by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland upon its ratification of that instrument on 7 April 1986.

The Argentine Republic reaffirms its sovereignty over the aforementioned archipelagos, which are integral part of its national territory, and recalls that the United Nations General Assembly has adopted resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12 and 39/6, in which a sovereignty dispute is recognized and the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom are urged to resume negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful and lasting solution to the dispute and their remaining differneces relating to this question, through the good offices of the Secretary-General. The General Assembly has also adopted resolutions 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 and

43/25, which reiterate its request to the parties to resume such negotiations.

Subsequently, on 27 November 1989, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following communication:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland reject the statement made by the Government of Argentina on 4 April 1989 regarding the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwichlands. The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Nothern Ireland have no doubt as to the British sovereignty of the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, and thei consequent right to extend treaties to those Territories."

Further, on 14 October 1996, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom a communication stating that it had decided to apply the Convention to Hong Kong, subject to the following reservations and declarations:

"General

(a) The United Kingdom on behalf of Hong Kong understands the main purpose of the Convention, in the light of the definition contained in article 1, to the reduction, in accordance with its terms, of discrimination against women, and does not therefore regard the Convention as imposing any requirement to repeal or modify any existing laws, regulations, customs or practices which provide for women to be treated more favourably than men, whether temporarily or in the longer term. Undertakings by the United Kingdom on behalf of Hong Kong under article 4, paragraph 1, and other provisions of the Convention are to be construed accordingly.

(b) The right to continue to apply such immigration legislation governing entry into, stay in and departure from Hong Kong as may be deemed necessary from time to time is reserved by the United Kingdom on behalf of Hong Kong. Accordingly, acceptance of article 15 (4), and of the other provisions of the Convention, is subject to the provisions of any such legislation as regards persons not at the time having the rightunder the law of Hong Kong to enter and remain in Hong Kong.

(c) In the light of the definition contained in article 1, the United Kingdom's extension of its ratification to Hong Kong is subject to the understanding that none of its obligations under the Convention in Hong Kong shall be treated as extending to the affairs of religious denominations or orders.

(d) Laws apcable in the New Territories which enable male indigenous villagers to exercise certain rights in respect of property and which provide for rent concessions in respect of land or property held by indigenous persons or their lawful successors through the male line will continue to be applied.

Specific articles

Article 9

The British Nationality Act 1981, which was brought into force with effect from January 1983, is based on principles which do not allow of any discrimination against women within the meaning of article 1 as regards acquisition, change, or retention of their nationality or as regards the nationality of their children. The United Kingdom's acceptance of article 9 on behalf of Hong Kong shall not, however, be taken to invalidate the continuation of certain temporary or transitional provisions which will continue in force beyond that date.

Article 11

The United Kingdom on behalf of Hong Kong reserves the right to apply all Hong Kong legislation and the rules of pension schemes affecting retirement pensions, survivors' benefits and other benefits in relation to death or retirement (including retirement on grounds of redundancy) whether or not derived from a social security scheme.

This reservation will apply equally to any further legislation which may modify or replace such legislation, or the rules of pension schemes, on the understanding that the terms of such legislation will be compatible with the United Kingdom's obligations under the Convention in respect of Hong Kong.

The United Kingdom on behalf of Hong Kong reserves the right to apply any non-discriminatory requirement for a qualifying period of employment for the application of the provisions contained in article 11(2).

Article 15

In relation to article 15, paragraph 3, the United Kingdom on behalf of Hong Kong understands the intention of this provisions to be that only those terms or elements of a contract or other private instrument which are discriminatory inthe sense described are to be deemed null and void, but not necessarily the contract or instrument as a whole."

[62] The formality was effected by Democratic Yemen. See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[63] Several Governments notified the Secretary-General that they consider the reservations made by the Government of Algeria upon accession as incompatible with the object and purpose of the said Convention and, therefore, prohibited by virtue of its article 28 (2), on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Participant:	***Date of notification:***		
Sweden	4	Aug	1997
Portugal	14	Aug	1997
Denmark	24	Mar	1998

[64] Several Governments notified the Secretary-General that they consider the reservations made by the Government of Kuwait concerning article 7 (a) and article 16 (f) as "incompatible with the object and purpose of the said Convention and, therefore, as prohibited by virtue of its article 28 paragraph 2" on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Participant:	***Date of notification:***		
Belgium	19	Jan	1996
Austria	22	Feb	1996
Portugal	15	May	1996

[65] On 9 January 2008, the Government of Luxembourg notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw

the reservations made upon ratification. The text of the reservations reads as follows:

a) The application of article 7 shall not affect the validity of the article of our Constitution concerning the hereditary transmission of the crown of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg in accordance with the family compact of the house of Nassau of 30 June 1783, maintained by article 71 of the Treaty of Vienna of 9 June 1815 and expressly maintained by article 1 of the Treaty of London of 11 May 1867.

(b) The application of paragraph 1 (g) of article 16 of the Convention shall not affect the right to choose the family name of children.

[66] In regard to the reservations made by the Government of Micronesia (Federated States of) upon accession, the Secretary-General received a communication from the following State on the date indicated hereinafter:

Portugal (15 December 2005):

The Government o f Portugal has carefully examined the reservations made by the Federated States of Micronesia upon its accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW).

The first and second reservations concern fundamental provisions of the Convention and are not in conformity with its object and purpose. Articles 2, 5, 11 and 16 outline the measures which a State party is required to take in order to implement the Convention, cover the fundamental rights of women and deal with key elements for the elimination and discrimination against women.

Portugal considers that such reservations may create doubts as to the commitment of the reserving State tp the objection and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international law.

It is in the common interest of all states that treaties to which have chosen tt become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply wit their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic, therefore, objects to the above reservations made by the Federated States of Micronesia to CEDAW.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Portugal and Micronesia.

[67] On 20 September 1999, the Government of Turkey notified the Secretary-General of a partial withdrawal as follows:

"[...] the Government of the Republic of Turkey has decided to withdraw its reservations made upon [accession to] the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women with regard to article 15, paragraphs 2 and 4, and article 16, paragraphs 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g).

[...] the reservation and declaration made upon [accession] by the Government of Turkey with respect to article 29, paragraph 1, and article 9, paragraph 1 of the Convention, respectively, continue to apply."

On 29 January 2008, the Government of the Republic of Turkey notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the following declaration in respect to article 9 (1) made upon accession:

"Article 9, paragraph 1 of the Convention is not in conflict with the provisions of article 5, paragraph 1, and article 15 and 17 of the Turkish Law on Nationality, relating to the acquisition of citizenship, since the intent of those provisions regulating acquisition of citizenship through marriage is to prevent statelessness."

8. a) Amendment to article 20, paragraph 1 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women

New York, 22 December 1995

NOT YET IN FORCE:	see paragraph 3 of Resolution 50/202 which reads as follows: "The amendment shall enter into force following consideration by the General Assembly and when it has been accepted by a two-thirds majority of States parties which shall have so notified the Secretary-General as depositary of the Convention.".
STATUS:	Parties: 53.
TEXT:	Doc. CEDAW/SP/1995/2.

Note: The amendment was proposed by the Governments of Denmark, Iceland, Finland, Norway and Sweden and communicated by the Secretary-General by depositary notification C.N.373.1994.TREATIES-8 of 23 January 1995 in accordance with article 26 (1) of the Convention. At their eighth meeting held on 22 May 1995, the States Parties to the above Convention decided to amend article 20 (1) of the Convention and adopted the amendment. By Resolution 50/202 adopted at its fiftieth session held on 22 December 1995, the General Assembly noted with approval the amendment.

Participant	*Acceptance(A)*
Andorra	14 Oct 2002 A
Australia	4 Jun 1998 A
Austria	11 Sep 2000 A
Azerbaijan	23 May 2008 A
Bahamas	17 Jan 2003 A
Bangladesh	3 May 2007 A
Brazil	5 Mar 1997 A
Canada	3 Nov 1997 A
Chile	8 May 1998 A
China	10 Jul 2002 A
Cook Islands	27 Nov 2007 A
Croatia	24 Oct 2003 A
Cuba	7 Mar 2008 A
Cyprus	30 Jul 2002 A
Denmark	12 Mar 1996 A
Egypt	2 Aug 2001 A
Finland	18 Mar 1996 A
France	8 Aug 1997 A
Georgia	30 Sep 2005 A
Germany	25 Feb 2002 A
Grenada	12 Dec 2007 A
Guatemala	3 Jun 1999 A
Iceland	8 May 2002 A
Ireland	11 Jun 2004 A
Italy	31 May 1996 A
Japan	12 Jun 2003 A
Jordan	11 Jan 2002 A
Lesotho	12 Nov 2001 A
Liberia	16 Sep 2005 A
Liechtenstein	15 Apr 1997 A
Lithuania	5 Aug 2004 A
Luxembourg	1 Jul 2003 A
Madagascar	19 Jul 1996 A
Maldives	7 Feb 2002 A
Mali	20 Jun 2002 A
Malta	5 Mar 1997 A
Mauritius	29 Oct 2002 A
Mexico	16 Sep 1996 A
Mongolia	19 Dec 1997 A
Netherlands[1]	10 Dec 1997 A
New Zealand	26 Sep 1996 A
Niger	1 May 2002 A
Norway	29 Mar 1996 A
Panama	5 Nov 1996 A
Philippines	12 Nov 2003 A
Portugal	8 Jan 2002 A
Republic of Korea	12 Aug 1996 A
Slovenia	10 Nov 2006 A
Sweden	17 Jul 1996 A
Switzerland	2 Dec 1997 A
Turkey	9 Dec 1999 A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[2]	19 Nov 1996 A
Uruguay	8 Jan 2004 A

Notes:

[1] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles an Aruba.

[2] For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern

Ireland, the Isle of Man, British Virgin Islands, Falkland Islands (Malvinas), and Turks and Caicos Islands.

8. b) Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women

New York, 6 October 1999

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	22 December 2000, in accordance with article 16(1)(see paragraph 16 of Resolution A/RES/54/4).
REGISTRATION:	22 December 2000, No. 20378.
STATUS:	Signatories: 79. Parties: 96.
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 2131, p. 83.

Note: The Protocol was adopted by resolution A/RES/54/4 of 6 October 1999 at the fifty-fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. In accordance with its article 15 (1), the Protocol will be open for signature by any State that has signed, ratified or acceded to the Convention at United Nations Headquarters in New York from 10 December 1999.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Albania		23 Jun 2003 a
Andorra	9 Jul 2001	14 Oct 2002
Angola		1 Nov 2007 a
Antigua and Barbuda		5 Jun 2006 a
Argentina[1]	28 Feb 2000	20 Mar 2007
Armenia		14 Sep 2006 a
Australia		4 Dec 2008 a
Austria	10 Dec 1999	6 Sep 2000
Azerbaijan	6 Jun 2000	1 Jun 2001
Bangladesh	6 Sep 2000	6 Sep 2000
Belarus	29 Apr 2002	3 Feb 2004
Belgium	10 Dec 1999	17 Jun 2004
Belize		9 Dec 2002 a
Benin	25 May 2000	
Bolivia	10 Dec 1999	27 Sep 2000
Bosnia and Herzegovina	7 Sep 2000	4 Sep 2002
Botswana		21 Feb 2007 a
Brazil	13 Mar 2001	28 Jun 2002
Bulgaria	6 Jun 2000	20 Sep 2006
Burkina Faso	16 Nov 2001	10 Oct 2005
Burundi	13 Nov 2001	
Cambodia	11 Nov 2001	
Cameroon		7 Jan 2005 a
Canada		18 Oct 2002 a
Chile	10 Dec 1999	
Colombia	10 Dec 1999	23 Jan 2007
Congo	29 Sep 2008	
Cook Islands		27 Nov 2007 a
Costa Rica	10 Dec 1999	20 Sep 2001
Croatia	5 Jun 2000	7 Mar 2001
Cuba	17 Mar 2000	
Cyprus	8 Feb 2001	26 Apr 2002
Czech Republic	10 Dec 1999	26 Feb 2001
Denmark	10 Dec 1999	31 May 2000
Dominican Republic	14 Mar 2000	10 Aug 2001
Ecuador	10 Dec 1999	5 Feb 2002
El Salvador	4 Apr 2001	
Finland	10 Dec 1999	29 Dec 2000
France	10 Dec 1999	9 Jun 2000
Gabon		5 Nov 2004 a
Georgia		1 Aug 2002 a
Germany	10 Dec 1999	15 Jan 2002
Ghana	24 Feb 2000	
Greece	10 Dec 1999	24 Jan 2002
Guatemala	7 Sep 2000	9 May 2002
Guinea-Bissau	12 Sep 2000	
Hungary		22 Dec 2000 a
Iceland	10 Dec 1999	6 Mar 2001
Indonesia	28 Feb 2000	
Ireland	7 Sep 2000	7 Sep 2000
Italy	10 Dec 1999	22 Sep 2000
Kazakhstan	6 Sep 2000	24 Aug 2001
Kyrgyzstan		22 Jul 2002 a
Lesotho	6 Sep 2000	24 Sep 2004
Liberia	22 Sep 2004	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		18 Jun 2004 a
Liechtenstein	10 Dec 1999	24 Oct 2001
Lithuania	8 Sep 2000	5 Aug 2004
Luxembourg	10 Dec 1999	1 Jul 2003
Madagascar	7 Sep 2000	
Malawi	7 Sep 2000	
Maldives		13 Mar 2006 a

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)
Mali		5 Dec 2000 a
Mauritius	11 Nov 2001	31 Oct 2008
Mexico	10 Dec 1999	15 Mar 2002
Mongolia	7 Sep 2000	28 Mar 2002
Montenegro[2]		23 Oct 2006 d
Mozambique		4 Nov 2008 a
Namibia	19 May 2000	26 May 2000
Nepal	18 Dec 2001	15 Jun 2007
Netherlands[3]	10 Dec 1999	22 May 2002
New Zealand[4]	7 Sep 2000	7 Sep 2000
Niger		30 Sep 2004 a
Nigeria	8 Sep 2000	22 Nov 2004
Norway	10 Dec 1999	5 Mar 2002
Panama	9 Jun 2000	9 May 2001
Paraguay	28 Dec 1999	14 May 2001
Peru	22 Dec 2000	9 Apr 2001
Philippines	21 Mar 2000	12 Nov 2003
Poland		22 Dec 2003 a
Portugal	16 Feb 2000	26 Apr 2002
Republic of Korea		18 Oct 2006 a
Republic of Moldova		28 Feb 2006 a
Romania	6 Sep 2000	25 Aug 2003
Russian Federation	8 May 2001	28 Jul 2004
Rwanda		15 Dec 2008 a
San Marino		15 Sep 2005 a
Sao Tome and Principe	6 Sep 2000	
Senegal	10 Dec 1999	26 May 2000
Serbia		31 Jul 2003 a
Seychelles	22 Jul 2002	
Sierra Leone	8 Sep 2000	
Slovakia	5 Jun 2000	17 Nov 2000
Slovenia	10 Dec 1999	23 Sep 2004
Solomon Islands		6 May 2002 a
South Africa		18 Oct 2005 a
Spain	14 Mar 2000	6 Jul 2001
Sri Lanka		15 Oct 2002 a
St. Kitts and Nevis		20 Jan 2006 a
Sweden	10 Dec 1999	24 Apr 2003
Switzerland	15 Feb 2007	29 Sep 2008
Tajikistan	7 Sep 2000	
Thailand	14 Jun 2000	14 Jun 2000
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	3 Apr 2000	17 Oct 2003
Timor-Leste		16 Apr 2003 a
Tunisia		23 Sep 2008 a
Turkey	8 Sep 2000	29 Oct 2002
Ukraine	7 Sep 2000	26 Sep 2003
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[5]		17 Dec 2004 a
United Republic of Tanzania		12 Jan 2006 a
Uruguay	9 May 2000	26 Jul 2001
Vanuatu		17 May 2007 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	17 Mar 2000	13 May 2002
Zambia	29 Sep 2008	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BANGLADESH

Declaration:

"The Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh declares in accordance with Article 10 (1) thereof, that it would not undertake the obligations arising out of Articles 8 and 9 of the said Optional Protocol."

BELGIUM

Upon signature

Declaration:

The Flemish, French and German-speaking Communities of Belgium are equally bound by this signature.

BELIZE

Declaration:

"WHEREAS, Article 10 of the Optional Protocol declares that at the time of acceding to the Optional Protocol, a State Party may declare that it does not recognize the competence of the Committee provided for in Articles 8 and 9 of the Optional Protocol

NOW THEREFORE, BELIZE, after having carefully considered Articles 8 and 9 of the Optional Protocol, hereby declares that it does not recognize the competence of the Committee provided for in Articles 8 and 9."

COLOMBIA

Declarations :

1. The Government of Colombia, exercising the discretion provided for in article 10 of the Optional Protocol, and subject to the conditions set out therein, declares that it does not recognize the competence of the Committee provided for in articles 8 and 9 of the Protocol.

2. The Government of Colombia understands article 5 of the Protocol to mean that interim measures not only preclude "a determination on admissibility or on the merits of the communication", as established in article 5, paragraph 2, but that any measures involving the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights shall be applied in keeping with the progressive nature of these rights.

3. The Government of Colombia declares that no provision of the Optional Protocol and no recommendation of the Committee may be interpreted as requiring Colombia to decriminalize offences against life or personal integrity.

CUBA

Upon signature:

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba declares that it does not recognize the competence of the committee established by virtue of articles 8 and 9 of the Protocol.

Notes:

[1] With the following :

The Argentine Republic wishes to reiterate the content of its notes of 3 April 1989 and 18 January 2005, by which it rejected the extension of the territorial application of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and of the Optional Protocol thereto, respectively, to the Malvinas Islands, notified by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The Argentine Republic recalls that the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and surrounding maritime areas are an integral part of the territory of the Argentine Republic and are illegally occupied by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, being the subject of a sovereignty dispute.

Because of the illegal occupation by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted resolutions 2065 (XX), 316[0] (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25, in which a sovereignty dispute regarding the "Question of the Malvinas Islands" is recognized and the Governments of the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland are urged to resume negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful and lasting solution to the dispute.

The United Nations Special Political and Decolonization Committee has repeatedly affirmed this view, most recently in its resolution of 15 June 2006.

[2] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

[4] With a declaration to the effect that "consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account its commitment to the development of self-government through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, this ratification shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory."

[5] With a territorial application to the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and the Isle of Man.

On 18 January 2005, the Secretary-General received, from the Government of Argentina, the following communication:

The Argentine Republic wishes to reiterate the content of its note of 3 April 1989, by which it rejected the extension of the territorial application of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women to the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, notified by the Government of the United Kingdom upon its ratification of that instrument on 7 April 1986.

The Argentine Republic similarly rejects the declaration of territorial application made by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland upon its accession to the 1999 Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, with respect to the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands. The Government of Argentina wishes to reiterate that the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and surrounding maritime areas are an integral part of the territory of the Argentine Republic and are illegally occupied by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, being the subject of a sovereignty dispute.

Because of the illegal occupation by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25, in which a sovereignty dispute regarding the "Question of the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands" is recognized and the Governments of the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland are urged to resume negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful and lasting solution to the dispute.

The United Nations Special Political and Decolonization Committee has repeatedly affirmed this view, most recently inits resolution of 18 June 2004 (A/59/23).

9. CONVENTION AGAINST TORTURE AND OTHER CRUEL, INHUMAN OR DEGRADING TREATMENT OR PUNISHMENT

New York, 10 December 1984

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 26 June 1987, in accordance with article 27(1).[1]
REGISTRATION: 26 June 1987, No. 24841.
STATUS: Signatories: 76. Parties: 146.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1465, p. 85.

Note: The Convention, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, was adopted by resolution 39/46[2] of 10 December 1984 at the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Convention is open for signature by all States, in accordance with its article 25.

Participant[3]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Afghanistan	4 Feb 1985	1 Apr 1987
Albania		11 May 1994 a
Algeria	26 Nov 1985	12 Sep 1989
Andorra	5 Aug 2002	22 Sep 2006
Antigua and Barbuda		19 Jul 1993 a
Argentina	4 Feb 1985	24 Sep 1986
Armenia		13 Sep 1993 a
Australia	10 Dec 1985	8 Aug 1989
Austria	14 Mar 1985	29 Jul 1987
Azerbaijan		16 Aug 1996 a
Bahamas	16 Dec 2008	
Bahrain		6 Mar 1998 a
Bangladesh		5 Oct 1998 a
Belarus	19 Dec 1985	13 Mar 1987
Belgium	4 Feb 1985	25 Jun 1999
Belize		17 Mar 1986 a
Benin		12 Mar 1992 a
Bolivia	4 Feb 1985	12 Apr 1999
Bosnia and Herzegovina[4]		1 Sep 1993 d
Botswana	8 Sep 2000	8 Sep 2000
Brazil	23 Sep 1985	28 Sep 1989
Bulgaria	10 Jun 1986	16 Dec 1986
Burkina Faso		4 Jan 1999 a
Burundi		18 Feb 1993 a
Cambodia		15 Oct 1992 a
Cameroon		19 Dec 1986 a
Canada	23 Aug 1985	24 Jun 1987
Cape Verde		4 Jun 1992 a
Chad		9 Jun 1995 a
Chile	23 Sep 1987	30 Sep 1988
China[5,6]	12 Dec 1986	4 Oct 1988
Colombia	10 Apr 1985	8 Dec 1987
Comoros	22 Sep 2000	
Congo		30 Jul 2003 a
Costa Rica	4 Feb 1985	11 Nov 1993
Côte d'Ivoire		18 Dec 1995 a
Croatia[4]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba	27 Jan 1986	17 May 1995
Cyprus	9 Oct 1985	18 Jul 1991
Czech Republic[7]		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic Republic of the Congo		18 Mar 1996 a
Denmark	4 Feb 1985	27 May 1987
Djibouti		5 Nov 2002 a
Dominican Republic	4 Feb 1985	
Ecuador	4 Feb 1985	30 Mar 1988
Egypt		25 Jun 1986 a
El Salvador		17 Jun 1996 a
Equatorial Guinea		8 Oct 2002 a
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Ethiopia		14 Mar 1994 a
Finland	4 Feb 1985	30 Aug 1989
France	4 Feb 1985	18 Feb 1986
Gabon	21 Jan 1986	8 Sep 2000
Gambia	23 Oct 1985	
Georgia		26 Oct 1994 a
Germany[3,8]	13 Oct 1986	1 Oct 1990
Ghana	7 Sep 2000	7 Sep 2000
Greece[8]	4 Feb 1985	6 Oct 1988
Guatemala		5 Jan 1990 a
Guinea	30 May 1986	10 Oct 1989
Guinea-Bissau	12 Sep 2000	
Guyana	25 Jan 1988	19 May 1988
Holy See		26 Jun 2002 a
Honduras		5 Dec 1996 a

Participant[3]	Signature	Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)
Hungary	28 Nov 1986	15 Apr 1987
Iceland	4 Feb 1985	23 Oct 1996
India	14 Oct 1997	
Indonesia	23 Oct 1985	28 Oct 1998
Ireland	28 Sep 1992	11 Apr 2002
Israel	22 Oct 1986	3 Oct 1991
Italy	4 Feb 1985	12 Jan 1989
Japan		29 Jun 1999 a
Jordan		13 Nov 1991 a
Kazakhstan		26 Aug 1998 a
Kenya		21 Feb 1997 a
Kuwait		8 Mar 1996 a
Kyrgyzstan		5 Sep 1997 a
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 a
Lebanon		5 Oct 2000 a
Lesotho		12 Nov 2001 a
Liberia		22 Sep 2004 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 May 1989 a
Liechtenstein	27 Jun 1985	2 Nov 1990
Lithuania		1 Feb 1996 a
Luxembourg	22 Feb 1985	29 Sep 1987
Madagascar	1 Oct 2001	13 Dec 2005
Malawi		11 Jun 1996 a
Maldives		20 Apr 2004 a
Mali		26 Feb 1999 a
Malta		13 Sep 1990 a
Mauritania		17 Nov 2004 a
Mauritius		9 Dec 1992 a
Mexico	18 Mar 1985	23 Jan 1986
Monaco		6 Dec 1991 a
Mongolia		24 Jan 2002 a
Montenegro[9]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	8 Jan 1986	21 Jun 1993
Mozambique		14 Sep 1999 a
Namibia		28 Nov 1994 a
Nauru	12 Nov 2001	
Nepal		14 May 1991 a
Netherlands[10]	4 Feb 1985	21 Dec 1988
New Zealand	14 Jan 1986	10 Dec 1989
Nicaragua	15 Apr 1985	5 Jul 2005
Niger		5 Oct 1998 a
Nigeria	28 Jul 1988	28 Jun 2001
Norway	4 Feb 1985	9 Jul 1986
Pakistan	17 Apr 2008	
Panama	22 Feb 1985	24 Aug 1987
Paraguay	23 Oct 1989	12 Mar 1990
Peru	29 May 1985	7 Jul 1988
Philippines		18 Jun 1986 a
Poland	13 Jan 1986	26 Jul 1989
Portugal[5]	4 Feb 1985	9 Feb 1989
Qatar		11 Jan 2000 a
Republic of Korea		9 Jan 1995 a
Republic of Moldova		28 Nov 1995 a
Romania		18 Dec 1990 a
Russian Federation	10 Dec 1985	3 Mar 1987
Rwanda		15 Dec 2008 a
San Marino	18 Sep 2002	27 Nov 2006
Sao Tome and Principe	6 Sep 2000	
Saudi Arabia		23 Sep 1997 a
Senegal	4 Feb 1985	21 Aug 1986
Serbia[4]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		5 May 1992 a
Sierra Leone	18 Mar 1985	25 Apr 2001
Slovakia[7]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia		16 Jul 1993 a
Somalia		24 Jan 1990 a
South Africa	29 Jan 1993	10 Dec 1998
Spain	4 Feb 1985	21 Oct 1987
Sri Lanka		3 Jan 1994 a
St. Vincent and the Grenadines		1 Aug 2001 a
Sudan	4 Jun 1986	
Swaziland		26 Mar 2004 a
Sweden	4 Feb 1985	8 Jan 1986
Switzerland	4 Feb 1985	2 Dec 1986
Syrian Arab Republic		19 Aug 2004 a
Tajikistan		11 Jan 1995 a
Thailand		2 Oct 2007 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[4]		12 Dec 1994 d
Timor-Leste		16 Apr 2003 a
Togo	25 Mar 1987	18 Nov 1987
Tunisia	26 Aug 1987	23 Sep 1988
Turkey	25 Jan 1988	2 Aug 1988
Turkmenistan		25 Jun 1999 a
Uganda		3 Nov 1986 a
Ukraine	27 Feb 1986	24 Feb 1987

Participant[3]	Signature	Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[6,11]	15 Mar 1985	8 Dec 1988
United States of America[12]	18 Apr 1988	21 Oct 1994
Uruguay	4 Feb 1985	24 Oct 1986
Uzbekistan		28 Sep 1995 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	15 Feb 1985	29 Jul 1991
Yemen		5 Nov 1991 a
Zambia		7 Oct 1998 a

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AFGHANISTAN

While ratifying the above-mentioned Convention, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, invoking paragraph 1 of the article 28, of the Convention, does not recognize the authority of the committee as foreseen in the article 20 of the Convention.

Also according to paragraph 2 of the article 30, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, will not be bound to honour the provisions of paragraph 1 of the same article since according to that paragraph 1 the compulsory submission of disputes in connection with interpretation or the implementation of the provisions of this Convention by one of the parties concerned to the International Court of Justice is deemed possible. Concerning to this matter, it declares that the settlement of disputes between the States Parties, such disputes may be referred to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice with the consent of all the Parties concerned and not by one of the Parties.

AUSTRIA

"1. Austria will establish its jurisdiction in accordance with article 5 of the Convention irrespective of the laws applying to the place where the offence occurred, but in respect of paragraph 1 (c) only if prosecution by a State having jurisdiction under para graph 1 (a) or paragraph 1 (b) is not to be expected.

"2. Austria regards article 15 as the legal basis for the inadmissibility provided for therein of the use of statements which are established to have been made as a result of torture."

BAHRAIN[13]

Reservations

...

2. The State of Bahrain does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 30 of the Convention.

BANGLADESH[14]

Declaration:

"The Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh will apply article 14 para 1 in consonance with the existing laws and legislation in the country."

BELARUS[15]

BOTSWANA

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The Government of the Republic of Botswana considers itself bound by Article 1 of the Convention to the extent that 'torture' means the torture and inhuman or degrading punishment or other treatment prohibited by Section 7 of the Constitution of the Republic of Botswana."

BULGARIA[16]

CHILE[17]

Upon signature:

...

2. The Government of Chile does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 30, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

3. The Government of Chile reserve the right to formulate, upon ratifying the Convention, any declarations or reservations it may deem necessary in the light of its domestic law.

Upon ratification:

The Government of Chile declares that in its relations with American States that are Parties to the Inter-American Convention to Prevent and Punish Torture, it will apply that Convention in cases where its provisions are incompatible with those of the present Convention.

...

CHINA

Reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"(1) The Chinese Government does not recognize the competence of the Committee against Torture as provided for in article 20 of the Convention.

"(2) The Chinese Government does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 30 of the Convention."

CUBA

Declarations:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba deplores the fact that even after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) containing the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, a provision such as paragraph 1 of article 2 was included in the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

The Government of the Republic declares, in accordance with article 28 of the Convention, that the provisions of paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of article 20 of the Convention will have to be invoked in strict compliance with the principle of the sovereignty of States and implemented with the prior consent of the States Parties.

In connection with the provisions of article 30 of the Convention, the Government of the Republic of Cuba is of the view that any dispute between Parties should be settled by negotiation through the diplomatic channel.

CZECH REPUBLIC[7]

ECUADOR

Reservation:

Ecuador declares that, in accordance with the provisions of article 42 of its Political Constitution, it will not permit extradition of its nationals.

EQUATORIAL GUINEA

Declaration and reservation:

First - The Government of Equatorial Guinea hereby declares that, pursuant to article 28 of this Convention, it does not recognize the competence of the Committee provided for in article 20 of the Convention.

Second - With reference to the provisions of article 30, the Government of Equatorial Guinea does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 thereof.

FRANCE

Reservation:

The Government of France declares in accordance with article 30, paragraph 2, of the Convention, that it shall not be bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of [article 30].

GERMANY[3]

Upon signature:

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany reserves the right to communicate, upon ratification, such reservations or declarations of interpretation as are deemed necessary especially with respect to the applicability of article 3.

Upon ratification:

Article 3

This provision prohibits the transfer of a person directly to a State where this person is exposed to a concrete danger of being subjected to torture. In the opinion of the Federal Republic of Germany, article 3 as well as the other provisions of the Convention exclusively establish State obligations that are met by the Federal Republic of Germany in conformity with the provisions of its domestic law which is in accordance with the Convention.

GHANA

Declaration:

"[The Government of Ghana declares] in accordance with Article 30 (2) of the said Convention that the submission under Article 30 (1) to arbitration or the International Court of Justice of disputes between State Parties relating to the interpretation or application of the said Convention shall be by the consent of ALL the Parties concerned and not by one or more of the Parties concerned."

GUATEMALA[18]

HOLY SEE

Declaration:

The Holy See considers the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment a valid and suitable instrument for fighting against acts that constitute a serious offence against the dignity of the human person. In recent times the Catholic Church has consistently pronounced itself in favour of unconditional respect for life itself and unequivocally condemned "whatever violates the integrity of the human person, such as mutilation, torments inflicted on body or mind, attempts to coerce the will itself" (Second Vatican Council, Pastoral Constitution Gaudium et spes, 7 December 1965).

The law of the Church (Code of Canon Law, 1981) and its catechism (Catechism of the Catholic Church, 1987) enumerate and clearly identify forms of behaviour that can harm the bodily or mental integrity of the individual, condemn their perpetrators and call for the abolition of such acts. On 14 January 1978, Pope Paul VI, in his last address to the diplomatic corps, after referring to the torture and mistreatment practised in various countries against individuals, concluded as follows: "How could the Church fail to take up a stern stand ... with regard to torture and to similar acts of violence inflicted on the human person?" Pope John Paul II, for his part, has not failed to affirm that "torture must be called by its proper name" (message for the celebration of the World Day of Peace, 1 January 1980). He has expressed his deep compassion for the victims of torture (World Congress on Pastoral Ministry for Human Rights, Rome, 4 July 1998), and in particular for tortured women (message to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, 1 March 1993). In this spirit the Holy See wishes to lend its moral support and collaboration to the international community, so as to contribute to the elimination of recourse to torture, which is inadmissible and inhuman.

The Holy See, in becoming a party to the Convention on behalf of the Vatican City State, undertakes to apply it insofar as it is compatible, in practice, with the peculiar nature of that State.

HUNGARY[19]

INDONESIA

Declaration:

"The Government of the Republic of Indonesia declares that the provisions of paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of article 20 of the Convention will have to be implemented in strict compliance with the principles of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States.

Reservation:

The Government of the Republic of Indonesia does not consider itself bound by the provision of article 30, paragraph 1, and takes the position that disputes relating to the interpretation and application of the Convention which cannot be settled through the channel provided for in paragraph 1 of the said article, may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all parties to the disputes."

ISRAEL

Reservations:

"1. In accordance with article 28 of the Convention, the State of Israel hereby declares that it does not recognize the competence of the Committee provided for in article 20.

"2. In accordance with paragraph 2 of article 30, the State of Israel hereby declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of that article."

KAZAKHSTAN

21 February 2008

In accordance with article 21, paragraph 1:

"..., the Republic of Kazakhstan hereby declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against torture under the conditions laid down in article 21, to receive and consider communications to the effect that another state party claims that the Republic of Kazakhstan is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention."

In accordance with article 22, paragraph 1:

"..., the Republic of Kazakhstan hereby declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against torture under the conditions laid down in article 22, to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by the Republic of Kazakhstan of the provisions of the Convention."

KUWAIT

Reservation:

"With reservations as to article (20) and the provision of paragraph (1) from article (30) of the Convention."

LUXEMBOURG

Interpretative declaration:

Article l

The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg hereby declares that the only "lawful sanctions" that it recognizes within the meaning of article 1, paragraph 1, of the Convention are those which are accepted by both national law and international law.

MAURITANIA

Reservations:

Article 20

The Mauritanian Government does not recognize the competence granted to the Committee in article 20 of the Convention, which provides as follows:

1. If the Committee receives reliable information which appears to it to contain well-founded indications that torture is being systematically practiced in the territory of a State Party, the Committee shall invite that State Party to cooperate in the examination of the information and to this end to submit observations with regard to the information concerned.
2. Taking into account any observations which may have been submitted by the State Party concerned, as well as any other relevant information available to it, the Committee may, if it decides that this is warranted, designate one or more of its members to make a confidential inquiry and to report to the Committee urgently.
3. If an inquiry is made in accordance with paragraph 2 of this article, the Committee shall seek the cooperation of the State Party concerned. In agreement with that State Party, such an inquiry may include a visit to its territory.
4. After examining the findings of its member or members submitted in accordance with paragraph 2 of this article, the Committee shall transmit these findings to the State Party concerned together with any comments or suggestions which seem appropriate in view of the situation.
5. All the proceedings of the Committee referred to in paragraphs 1 to 4 of this article shall be confidential, and at all stages of the proceedings the cooperation of the State Party shall be sought. After such proceedings have been completed with regard to an inquiry made in accordance with paragraph 2, the Committee may, after consultations with the State Party concerned, decide to include a summary account of the results of the proceedings in its annual report made in accordance with article 24.

Article 30, paragraph 1

1. Any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation orapplication of this Convention which cannot be settled through negotiation shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration. If within six months from the date of the request for arbitration the Parties are unable to agree on the organization of the arbitration, any one of those Parties may refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice by request in conformity with the Statute of the Court.

Pursuant to article 30, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Government of Mauritania declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of this article, which provides that in the event of a dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, one of the Parties may refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice by request.

MONACO

Reservation:

In accordance with paragraph 2 of article 30 of the Convention, the Principality of Monaco declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of that article.

MOROCCO[20]

Reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

.....

2. In accordance with article 30, paragraph 2, the Government of the Kingdom of Morocco does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of the same article.

NETHERLANDS

Interpretative declaration with respect to article 1:

"It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that the term "lawful sanctions" in article 1, paragraph 1, must be understood as referring to those sanctions which are lawful not only under national law but also under international law."

NEW ZEALAND

Reservation:

"The Government of New Zealand reserves the right to award compensation to torture victims referred to in article 14 of the Convention Against Torture only at the discretion of the Attorney-General of New Zealand."

PAKISTAN

Upon signature

Reservation:

"The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan reserves its right to attach appropriate reservations, make declarations and state its understanding in respect of various provisions of the Convention at the time of ratification."

PANAMA

The Republic of Panama declares in accordance with article 30, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of the said article.

POLAND

Upon signature:

Under article 28, the Polish People's Republic does not consider itself bound by article 20 of the Convention.

Furthermore, the Polish People's Republic does not consider itself bound by article 30, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

QATAR[21]

Reservations:

(a) Any interpretation of the provisions of the Convention that is incompatible with the precepts of Islamic law and the Islamic religion;

and

(b) The competence of the Committee as indicated in articles 21 and 22 of the Convention.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[15]

SAUDI ARABIA

Reservations:

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia does not recognize the jurisdiction of the Committee as provided for in article 20 of this Convention.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia shall not be bound by the provisions of paragraph (1) of article 30 of this Convention.

SLOVAKIA[7]

SOUTH AFRICA

Declaration:

"[The Republic of South Africa declares that] it recognises, for the purposes of article 30 of the Convention, the competence of the International Court of Justice to settle a dispute between two or more State Parties regarding the interpretation or application of the Convention, respectively."

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Declarations:

In accordance with the provisions of article 28, paragraph 1, of the Convention, the Syrian Arab Republic does not recognize the competence of the Committee against Torture provided for in article 20 thereof;

The accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to this Convention shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or entail entry into any dealings with Israel in the context of the provisions of this Convention.

THAILAND

Interpretative declaration:

"1. With respect to the term "torture" under Article 1 of the Convention, although there is neither a specific definition nor particular offence under the current Thai Penal Code corresponding to the term, there are comparable provisions under the aforesaid Thai Penal Code applicable to acts under Article 1 of the Convention. The term "torture" under Article 1 of the Convention shall accordingly be interpreted in conformity with the current Thai Penal Code.

The Kingdom of Thailand shall revise its domestic law to be more consistent with Article 1 of the Convention at the earliest opportunity.

2. For the same reason as stipulated in the preceding paragraph, Article 4 of the Convention which stipulates: 'Each State Party shall ensure that all acts of torture are offences under its criminal law. The same shall apply to an attempt to commit torture and to an act by any person which constitutes complicity or participation in torture,' shall be interpreted in conformity with the current Thai Penal Code.

The Kingdom of Thailand shall revise its domestic law to be more consistent with Article 4 of the Convention at the earliest opportunity.

3. Article 5 of the Convention which provides: 'Each State Party shall take such measures as may be necessary to establish its jurisdiction over the offences referred to in Article 4....." is interpreted by the Kingdom of Thailand to mean that the jurisdiction referred to in Article 5 shall be established in accordance with the current Thai Penal Code.

The Kingdom of Thailand shall revise its domestic law to be more consistent with Article 5 of the Convention at the earliest opportunity."

Reservation:

"The Kingdom of Thailand does not consider itself bound by Article 30, paragraph 1, of the Convention."

TOGO

Upon signature:

The Government of the Togolese Republic reserves the right to formulate, upon ratifying the Convention, any reservations or declarations which it might consider necessary.

TUNISIA

Upon signature:

The Government of Tunisia reserves the right to make at some later stage any reservation or declaration which it deems necessary, in particular with regard to articles 20 and 21 of the said Convention.

Upon ratification:

[The Government of Tunisia] confirms that the reservations made at the time of signature of the Convention on Tunisia's behalf on 26 August 1987 have been completely withdrawn.

TURKEY

Reservation:

"The Government of Turkey declares in accordance with article 30, paragraph 2, of the Convention, that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of this article."

UKRAINE[15]

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Upon signature:

"The United Kingdom reserves the right to formulate, upon ratifying the Convention, any reservations or interpretative declarations which it might consider necessary."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA[22]

Upon signature :

Declaration:

"The Government of the United States of America reserves the right to communicate, upon ratification, such reservations, interpretive understandings, or declarations as are deemed necessary."

Upon ratification :

Reservations:

"I. The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following reservations:

(1) That the United States considers itself bound by the obligation under article 16 to prevent `cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment', only insofar as the term `cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment' means the cruel, unusual and inhumane treatment or punishment prohibited by the Fifth, Eighth, and/or Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

(2) That pursuant to article 30 (2) the United States declares that it does not consider itself bound by Article 30 (1), but reserves the right specifically to agree to follow this or any other procedure for arbitration in a particular case.

II. The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following understandings, which shall apply to the obligations of the United States under this Convention:

(1) (a) That with reference to article 1, the United States understands that, in order to constitute torture, an act must be specifically intended to inflict severe physical or mental pain or suffering and that mental pain or suffering refers to prolonged mental harm caused by or resulting from (1) the intentional infliction or threatened infliction of severe physical pain or suffering; (2) the administration or application, or threatened administration or application, of mind altering substances or other procedures calculated to disrupt profoundly the senses or the personality; (3) the threat of imminent death; or (4) the threat that another person will imminently be subjected to death, severe physical pain or suffering, or the administration or application of mind altering substances or other procedures calculated to disrupt profoundly the senses or personality.

(b) That the United States understands that the definition of torture in article 1 is intended to apply only to acts directed against persons in the offender's custody or physical control.

(c) That with reference to article 1 of the Convention, the United States understands that `sanctions' includes judicially-imposed sanctions and other enforcement actions authorized by United States law or by judicial interpretation of such law. Nonetheless, the United States understands that a State Party could not through its domestic sanctions defeat the object and purpose of the Convention to prohibit torture.

(d) That with reference to article 1 of the Convention, the United States understands that the term `acquiescence' requires that the public official, prior to the activity constituting torture, have awareness of such activity and thereafter breach his legal responsibility to intervene to prevent such activity.

(e) That with reference to article 1 of the Convention, the Unites States understands that noncompliance with applicable legal procedural standards does not *per se* constitute torture.

(2) That the United States understands the phrase, `where there are substantial grounds for believing that he would be in danger of being subjected to torture,' as used in article 3 of the Convention, to mean `if it is more likely than not that he would be tortured.'

(3) That it is the understanding of the United States that article 14 requires a State Party to provide a private right of action for damages only for acts of torture committed in territory under the jurisdiction of that State Party.

(4) That the United States understands that international law does not prohibit the death penalty, and does not consider this Convention to restrict or prohibit the United States from applying the death penalty consistent with the Fifth, Eighth and/or Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, including any constitutional period of confinement prior to the imposition of the death penalty.

(5) That the United States understands that this Convention shall be implemented by the United States Government to the extent that it exercises legislative and judicial jurisdiction over the matters covered by the Convention and otherwise by the state and local governments. Accordingly, in implementing articles 10-14 and 16, the United States Government shall take measures appropriate to the Federal system to the end that the competent authorities of the constituent units of the United States of America may take appropriate measures for the fulfilment of the Convention.

III. The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following declarations:

(1) That the United States declares that the provisions of articles 1 through 16 of the Convention are not self-executing.

ZAMBIA[23]

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

DENMARK

4 October 2001

With regard to the reservation made by Botswana upon ratification:

"The Government of Denmark has examined the contents of the reservation made by the Government of Botswana to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The reservation refers to legislation in force in Botswana as to the definition of torture and thus to the scope of application of the Convention. In the absence of further clarification the Government of Denmark considers that the reservation raises doubts as to the commitment of Botswana to fullfil her obligations under the Convention and is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

For these reasons, the Government of Denmark objects to this reservation made by the Government of Botswana. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention in its entirety between Botswana and Denmark without Botswana benefiting from the reservation."

FINLAND

27 February 1996

With regard to the reservations, understandings and declarations made by the United States of America upon ratification:

"A reservation which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define to the other Parties of the Convention the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Convention and therefore may cast doubts about the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. Such a reservation is also, in the view of the Government of Finland, subject to the general principle to treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform a treaty.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the reservation made by the United States to article 16 of the Convention [(cf. Reservation I.(1)]. In this connection the Government of Finland would also like to refer to its objection to the reservation entered by the United States with regard to article 7 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. *[For the text of the objection see under "Objections" in chapter IV.4].*

13 December 1999

With regard to the declaration made by Bangladesh upon accession:

"The Government of Finland has examined the contents of the declaration made by the Government of Bangladesh to Article 14 paragraph 1 to the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and notes that the declaration constitutes a reservation as it seems to modify the obligations of Bangladesh under the said article.

A reservation which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define for the other Parties of the Convention the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Convention and therefore may raise doubts as to the commitment ofthe reserving state to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. Such a reservation is also, in the view of the Government of Finland, subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

Therefore the Government of Finland objects to the aforesaid reservation to Article 14 paragraph 1 made by the Government of Bangladesh. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Bangladesh and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without Bangladesh benefitting from these reservations".

16 January 2001

With regard to the reservation made by Qatar upon accession:

"The Government of Finland has examined the context of the reservation made by the Government of Qatar regarding any interpretation incompatible with the precepts of Islamic law and the Islamic religion. The Government of Finland notes that a reservation which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define for the other Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Convention and may therefore raise doubts as to the commitment of the reserving state to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. Such a reservation, in the view of the Government of Finland, is subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

The Government of Finland also notes that the reservation of Qatar, being of such a general nature, raises doubts as to the full commitment of Qatar to the object and purpose of the Convention and would like to recall that, according to the Vienna Convention on the Law of the Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

For the above-mentioned reasons the Government of Finland objects to the reservation made by the Government of Qatar. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Qatar and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without Qatar benefitting from this reservation."

FRANCE

30 September 1999

With regard to the declaration made by Bangladesh upon accession:

The Government of France notes that the declaration made by Bangladesh in fact constitutes a reservation since it is aimed at precluding or modifying the legal effect of certain provisions of the treaty. A reservation which consists in a general reference to domestic law without specifying its contents does not clearly indicate to the other parties to what extent the State which issued the reservation commits itself when acceding to the Convention. The Government of France considers the reservation of Bangladesh incompatible with the objective and purpose of the treaty, in respect of which the provisions relating to the right of victims of acts of torture to obtain redress and compensation, which ensure the effectiveness and tangible realization of obligations under the Convention, are essential, and consequently lodges an objection to the reservation entered by Bangladesh regarding article 14, paragraph 1. This objection does not prevent the entry into force of the Convention between Bangladesh and France.

24 January 2001

With regard to the reservation made by Qatar upon accession:

The Government of the French Republic has carefully considered the reservation made by the Government of Qatar to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment of 10 December 1984, whereby it excludes any interpretation of the Convention which would be incompatible with the precepts of Islamic law and the Islamic religion. The reservation, which seeks to give precedence to domestic law and practices over the Convention to an indeterminate extent, is comprehensive in scope. Its terms undermine the commitment of Qatar and make it impossible for the other States parties to assess the extent of that commitment. The Government of France consequently objects to the reservation made by Qatar.

GERMANY

23 January 2001

With regard to the reservation made by Qatar upon accession:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has examined the reservation to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment made by the Government of Qatar. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the view that the reservation with regard to compatibility of the rules of the Convention with the precepts of Islamic law and the Islamic religion raises doubts as to the commitment of Qatar to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers this reservation to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. Therefore the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Qatar to the Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and Qatar."

LUXEMBOURG

6 April 2000

With regard to the reservation made by Qatar upon accession:

The Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg has examined the reservation made by the Government of the State of Qatar to [the Convention] regarding any interpretation incompatible with the precepts of Islamic law and the Islamic religion.

The Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg considers that this reservation, by referring in a general way to both Islamic law and the Islamic religion without specifying their content, raises doubts among other States Parties about the degree to which the State of Qatar is committed to the observance of the Convention.

The Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg believes that the aforementioned reservation of the Government of the State of Qatar is incompatible with the objective and purpose of the Convention, because it refers to it as a whole and seriously limits or even excludes its application on a poorly defined basis, as in the case of the global reference to Islamic law.

Consequently, the Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg objects to the aforementioned reservation made by the Government of the State of Qatar to [the Convention]. This objection does not prevent the entry into force of the Convention between the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg and the State of Qatar.

NETHERLANDS

26 February 1996

With regard to the reservations, understandings and declarations made by the United States of America upon ratification:

"The Government of the Netherlands considers the reservation made by the United States of America regarding the article 16 of [the Convention] to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, to which the obligation laid down in article 16 is essential. Moreover, it is not clear how the provisions of the Constitution of the United States of America relate to the obligations under the Convention. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the said reservation. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the United States of America.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers the following understandings to have no impact on the obligations of the United States of America under the Convention:

II. 1 a This understanding appears to restrict the scope of the definition of torture under article 1 of the Convention.

1 d This understanding diminishes the continuous responsibility of public officials for behaviour of their subordinates.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands reserves its position with regard to the understandings II. 1b, 1c and 2 as the contents thereof are insufficiently clear.

19 January 2001

With regard to the reservation made by Qatar upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservation concerning the national law of Qatar, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention by invoking national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of this State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they hav chosen to become party should be respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Qatar.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Qatar."

NORWAY

18 January 2001

With regard to the reservation made by Qatar upon accession:

"It is the Government of Norway's position that paragraph (a) of the reservation, due to its unlimited scope and undefined character, is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, and thus impermissible according to well established treaty law. The Government of Norway therefore objects to paragraph (a) of the reservation.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Convention between the Kingdom of Norway and Qatar. The Convention thus becomes operative between Norway and Qatar without Qatar benefitting from the said reservation."

4 October 2001

With regard to the reservation made by Botswana upon ratification:

"The Government of Norway has examined the contents of the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Botswana upon ratification of the Convention Against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

The reservation's reference to the national Constitution without further description of its contents, exempts the other States Parties to the Convention from the possibility of assessing the effects of the reservation. In addition, as the reservation concerns one of the core provisions of the Convention, it is the position of the Government of Norway that the reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. Norway therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of Botswana.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Convention between the Kingdom of Norway and the Republic of Botswana. The Convention thus becomes operative between Norway and Botswana without Botswana benefiting from the said reservation."

SPAIN

13 December 1999

With regard to the declaration to article 14 (1) made by Bangladesh upon accession:

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that this declaration is actually a reservation, since its purpose is to exclude or modify the application of the legal effect of certain provisions of the Convention. Moreover, in referring in a general way to the domestic laws of Bangladesh, without specifying their content, the reservation raises doubts among the other States parties as to the extent to which the People's Republic of Bangladesh is committed to ratifying the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain believes that the reservation lodged by the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh is incompatible with the objective and purpose of the Convention, for which the provisions concerning redress and compensation for victims of torture are essential factors in the concrete fulfilment of the commitments made under the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain therefore states an objection to the above-mentioned reservation lodged by the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the Convention against Torture and Other

Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, concerning article 14, paragraph 1, of that Convention.

This objection does not affect the entry into force of the above-mentioned Convention between the Kingdom of Spain and the People's Republic of Bangladesh.

14 March 2000

With regard to the reservation made by Qatar upon accession:

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has examined the reservation made by the Government of the State of Qatar to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment on 11 January 2000, as to any interpretation of the Convention that is incompatible with the precepts of Islamic law and the Islamic religion.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that, by making a general reference to Islamic law and religion rather than to specific content, this reservation raises doubts among the other States parties as to the extent of the commitment of the State of Qatar to abide by the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers the reservation made by the Government of the State of Qatar to be incompatible with the purpose and aim of the Convention, in that it relates to the entire Convention and seriously limits or even excludes its application on a basis which is not clearly defined, namely, a general reference to Islamic law.

Accordingly, the Government of the Kingdom of Spain objects to the above-mentioned reservation made by the Government of the State of Qatar to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. This objection does not prevent the Convention's entry into force between the Government of Spain and the Government of the State of Qatar.

SWEDEN

27 February 1996

With regard to the reservations, understandings and declarations made by the United States of America upon ratification:

"The Government of Sweden would like to refer to its objections to the reservations entered by the United States of America with regard to article 7 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. *[For the text of the objections see under "Objections" in chapter IV.4]* . The same reasons for objection apply to the now entered reservation with regard to article 16 reservation I (1) of [the Convention]. The Government of Sweden therefore objects to that reservation.

It is the view of the Government of Sweden that the understandings expressed by the United States of America do not relieve the United States of America as a party to the Convention from the responsibility to fulfil the obligations undertaken therein."

14 December 1999

With regard to the declaration to article 14 (1) made by Bangladesh upon accession:

"In this context the Government of Sweden would like to recall, that under well-established international treaty law, the name assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified, does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. Thus, the Government of Sweden considers that the declaration made by the Government of Bangladesh, in the absence of further clarification, in substance constitutes a reservation to the Convention.

The Government of Sweden notes that the said declaration imply that the said article of the Convention is being made subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of existing laws and regulations in the country.

The Government of Sweden is of the view that this declaration raises doubts as to the commitment of Bangladesh to the object and purpose of the Convention and would recall that, according to well-established international law, a resertion incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid declaration made by the Government of Bangladesh to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

27 April 2000

With regard to the reservations made by the Qatar upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservations made by the Government of Qatar at the time of its accession to the [Convention], as to the competence of the committee and to any interpretation of the provisions of the Convention that is incompatible with the precepts of Islamic laws and the Islamic religion.

The Government of Sweden is of the view that as regards the latter, this general reservation, which does not clearly specify the provisions of the Convention to which it applies and the extent of the derogation therefrom, raises doubts as to the commitment of Qatar to the object and purpose of the Convention.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

According to customary law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid general reservation made by the Government of Qatar to the [Convention].

This shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the State of Qatarand the Kingdom of Sweden, without Qatar benefiting from the said reservation".

2 October 2001

With regard to the reservation made by the Botswana upon ratification:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by Botswana upon ratification of the 1984 Convention Against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, regarding article 1 of the Convention.

The Government of Sweden notes that the said article of the Convention is being made subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of existing legislation in Botswana. Article 1.2 of the Convention states that the definition of torture in article 1.1 is "without prejudice to any international instrument or national legislation which does or may contain provisions of wider application".

The Government of Sweden is of the view that this reservation, in the absence of further clarification, raises doubts as to the commitment of Botswana to the object and purpose of the Convention. The government of Sweden would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Botswana to the Convention Against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Botswana and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Botswana benefiting from its reservation."

29 September 2008

With regard to the interpretative declaration made by Thailand upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden recalls that the designation assigned to a statement does not determine whether or not it constitutes a reservation to a treaty. If the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified by an interpretative declaration, this in fact amounts to a reservation.

Since the application of a number of provisions of the Convention have been made subject to provisions of the Thai Penal Code it is unclear to what extent the Kingdom of Thailand considers itself bound by the obligations of the treaty. This in turn raises doubts as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Thailand to the object and purpose of the Convention. This applies in particular to the declaration

made under Article 1 of the Convention which contains a clear and generally recognized definition of the concept of torture.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Kingdom of Thailand to the Convention Against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

This objection shall not precludethe entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Thailand and Sweden, without the Kingdom of Thailand benefiting from its reservation."

Declarations made under articles 21 and 22
(Declarations recognizing the Competence of the Committee against Torture)
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ALGERIA

Article 21

The Algerian Government declares, pursuant to article 21 of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee Against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

Article 22

The Algerian Government declares, pursuant to article 22 of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

ANDORRA

22 November 2006

1. The Principality of Andorra recognizes, in accordance with article 21 of the Convention, the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention.

2. The Principality of Andorra recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction, who claim to be victims of a violation of the provisions of the Convention.

ARGENTINA

The Argentine Republic recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention. It also recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

AUSTRALIA

28 January 1993

"The Government of Australia hereby declares that it recognises, for and on behalf of Australia, the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the aforesaid Convention; and

The Government of Australia hereby declares that it recognises, for and on behalf of Australia, the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to Australia's jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the aforesaid Convention."

AUSTRIA

"Austria recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

"Austria recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to Austrian jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation of the provisions of the Convention."

AZERBAIJAN

4 February 2002

".....the Government of the Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

BELGIUM

In accordance with article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention, Belgium declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State

Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention."

In accordance with article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention, Belgium declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

BOLIVIA

14 February 2006

"The Government of Bolivia recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture as provided for under article 21 of the Convention."

"The Government of Bolivia recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture as provided for under article 22 of the Convention."

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

4 June 2003

"The State of Bosnia and Herzegovina...., accepts without reservations the competence of the Committee Against Torture [in accordance with article 22]."

BRAZIL

26 June 2006

".....the Federative Republic of Brazil recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider denunciations of violations of the provisions of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, adopted in New York on December 10, 1984, as permitted by Article 22 of the Convention."

BULGARIA

12 May 1993

"The Republic of Bulgaria declares that in accordance with article 21 (2) of the Convention it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention."

The Republic of Bulgaria declares that in accordance with article 22 (1) of the Convention it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of this Convention."

BURUNDI

10 June 2003

The Government of the Republic of Burundi declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee of the United Nations against Torture to receive and consider individual communications in accordance with article 22, paragraph 1 of the United Nations Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, adopted at New York on 10 December 1984.

CAMEROON

12 October 2000

[The Republic of Cameroon declares], that [it] recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from a State Party claiming that the Republic of Cameroon is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention. However, such communications will not be receivable unless they refer to situations and facts subsequent to this declaration and emanate from a State Party which has made a similar declaration indicating its reciprocal acceptance of the competence of the Committee with regard to itself at least twelve (12) months before submitting its communication. [The Republic of Cameroon also declares] that it recognizes, in the case of situations and facts subsequent to this declaration, the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

CANADA

13 November 1989

"The Government of Canada declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee Against Torture, pursuant to article 21 of the said Convention, to receive and consider communications to the effect that a state party claims that another state party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

"The Government of Canada also declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee Against Torture, pursuant to article 22 of the said Convention, to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a state party of the provisions of the Convention."

CHILE

15 March 2004

By virtue of the powers vested in me by the Constitution of the Republic of Chile, I should like to declare that the Government of Chile recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture established pursuant to article 17 of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 39/46 of 10 December 1984, with respect to acts of which the commencement of execution is subsequent to the communication of this declaration by the Republic of Chile to the Secretary-General of the United Nations:

(a) To receive and consider communications to the effect that a State party claims that the State of Chile is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention, in accordance with article 21 thereof; and

(b) To receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by the State of Chile of the provisions of the Convention, in accordance with article 22 thereof.

COSTA RICA

27 February 2002

.....the Republic of Costa Rica, with a view to strengthening the international instruments in this field and in accordance with full respect for human rights, the essence of Costa Rica's foreign policy, recognizes, unconditionally and during the period of validity of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention.

Furthermore, the Republic of Costa Rica recognizes, unconditionally and during the period of validity of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

The foregoing is in accordance with articles 21 and 22 of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 10 December 1984.

CROATIA

Made upon succession:

"[The] Republic of Croatia . . . accepts the competence of the Committee in accordance with articles 21 and 22 of the said Convention."

CYPRUS

8 April 1993

"The Republic of Cyprus recognizes the competence of the Committee established under article 17 of the Convention [...]:

I. to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention (article 21), and

II. to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention (Article 22)."

CZECH REPUBLIC

3 September 1996

The Czech Republic declares that in accordance with article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

The Czech Republic declares, in accordance with article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention, it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals within its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

DENMARK

"The Government of Denmark [. . .] recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that the State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

"The Government of Denmark [. . .] recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

ECUADOR

6 September 1988

The Ecuadorian State, pursuant to article 21 of the International Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention; it also recognizes in regard to itself the competence of the Committee, in accordance with article 21.

It further declares, in accordance with the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

FINLAND

"Finland declares that it recognizes fully the competence of the Committee against Torture as specified in article 21, paragraph 1 and article 22, paragraph 1 of the Convention."

FRANCE

23 June 1988

The Government of France declares [. . .] that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention.

The Government of France declares [. . .] that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

GEORGIA

30 June 2005

"In accordance with article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment done at New York on December 10, 1984 Georgia hereby declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture under the conditions laid down in article 21, to receive and consider communications to the effect that another state party claims that Georgia is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

In accordance with article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment done at New York on December 10, 1984 Georgia hereby declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture under the conditions laid down in article 22, to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by Georgia of the provisions of the Convention."

GERMANY

19 October 2001

In accordance with article 21 (1) of the Convention, the Federal Republic of Germany declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention. In accordance with article 22 (1) of the Convention, the Federal Republic of Germany declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by the Federal Republic of Germany of the provisions of the Convention.

GHANA

"The Government of the Republic of Ghana recognises the competence of the Committee Against Torture to consider complaints brought by or against the Republic in respect of another State Party which has made a Declaration recognising the competence of the Committee as well as individuals subject to the jurisdiction of the Republic who claim to be victims of any violations by the Republic of the provsions of the said Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Ghana interprets Article 21 and Article 22 as giving the said Committee the competence to receive and consider complaints in respect of matters occurring after the said Convention had entered into force for Ghana and shall not apply to decisions, acts, omissions or events relating to matters, events, omissions, acts or developments occurring before Ghana becomes a party."

GREECE

Article 21

The Hellenic Republic declares, pursuant to article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention.

Article 22

The Hellenic Republic declares, pursuant to article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claims to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

GUATEMALA

25 September 2003

In accordance with article 22 of the Convention..., the Republic of Guatemala recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation of the provisions of the Convention in respect of acts, omissions, situations or events occurring after the date of the present declaration.

HUNGARY

13 September 1989

[The Government of Hungary] recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture provided for in articles 21 and 22 of the Convention.

ICELAND

23 October 1996

"[The Government of Iceland declares], pursuant to article 21, paragraph 1, of the [said] Convention, that Iceland recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention and, pursuant to article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention, that Iceland recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

IRELAND

11 April 2002

"Ireland declares, in accordance with article 21 of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

Ireland declares, in accordance with article 22 of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

ITALY

10 October 1989

"Article 21: Italy hereby declares, in accordance with article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention;

"Article 22: Italy hereby declares, in accordance with article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of violations by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

JAPAN

"The Government of Japan declares under article 21 of the Convention that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention."

LIECHTENSTEIN

The Principality of Liechtenstein recognizes, in accordance with article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention, the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

The Principality of Liechtenstein recognizes in accordance with article 22, paragraph 1, the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

LUXEMBOURG

Article 21

The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg hereby declares [. . .] that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

Article 22

The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg hereby declares [. . .] that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

MALTA

The Government of Malta fully recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture as specified in article 21, paragraph 1, and article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

MEXICO

15 March 2002

The United Mexican States recognizes as duly binding the competence of the Committee against Torture, established by article 17 of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 10 December 1984.

Pursuant to Article 22 of the Convention, the United Mexican States declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

MONACO

In accordance with article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention, the Principality of Monaco declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

In accordance with article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention, the Principality of Monaco declares, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

MONTENEGRO[9]

Confirmed upon succession:

"Yugoslavia recognizes, in compliance with article 21, paragraph 1 of the Convention, the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications in which one State Party to the Convention claims that another State Party does not fulfil the obligations pursuant to the Convention;

"Yugoslavia recognizes, in conformity with article 22, paragraph 1 of the Convention, the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

MOROCCO

19 October 2006

The Government of the Kingdom of Morocco declares, under article 22 of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, that it recognizes, on the date of deposit of the present document, the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation, subsequent to the date of deposit of the present document, of the provisions of the Convention.

NETHERLANDS

"With respect to article 21:

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands hereby declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture under the conditions laid down in article 21, to receive and consider communications to the effect that another State Party claims that the Kingdom is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention;

"With respect to article 22:

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands hereby declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture, under the conditions laid down in article 22, to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by the Kingdom of the provisions of the Convention."

NEW ZEALAND

"1. In accordance with article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention, [the Government of New Zealand declares] that it recognises the competence of the Committee Against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention; and

"2. In accordance with article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention, [the Government of New Zealand] recognises the competence of the Committee Against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

NORWAY

"Norway recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

"Norway recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

PARAGUAY

29 May 2002

.....the Government of the Republic of Paraguay recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture, pursuant to articles 21 and 22 of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 10 December 1984.

.....the Honourable National Congress of the Republic of Paraguay has granted its approval for the recognition of the competence of the Committee to receive communications from States parties and individuals.

PERU

The Republic of Peru recognizes, in accordance with Article 21 of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the said Convention.

Likewise, the Republic of Peru recognizes, in accordance with the provisions of Article 22 of the above-mentioned Convention, the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

POLAND

12 May 1993

"The Government of the Republic of Poland, in accordance with articles 21 and 22 of the Convention, recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that the Republic of Poland is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention or communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by the Republic of Poland of the provisions of the Convention."

PORTUGAL

"Article 21

Portugal hereby declares, in accordance with article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee Against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that the State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

"Article 22

Portugal hereby declares, in accordance with article 22, paragraph 1 of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee Against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of violation by State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

9 November 2007

The Republic of Korea recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture, pursuant to Article 21 of the ..... Convention, to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention…

[The Republic of Korea] ..... recognizes the competence of the ..... Committee [against Torture], pursuant to Article 22 of the ..... Convention, to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[15]

1 October 1991

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that, pursuant to article 21 of the Convention, it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications in respect of situations and events occurring after the adoption of the present declaration, to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics also declares that, pursuant to article 22 of the Convention, it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications in respect of situations or events occurring after the adoption of the present declaration, from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

SENEGAL

16 October 1996

The Government of the Republic of Senegal declares, in accordance with article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communciations to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Senegal declares, in accordance with article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

SERBIA

Confirmed upon succession:

"Yugoslavia recognizes, in compliance with article 21, paragraph 1 of the Convention, the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications in which one State Party to the Convention claims that another State Party does not fulfil the obligations pursuant to the Convention;

"Yugoslavia recognizes, in conformity with article 22, paragraph 1 of the Convention, the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

SEYCHELLES

6 August 2001

Article 22:

"The Republic of Seychelles accepts without reservations the competence of the Committee Against Torture."

SLOVAKIA

17 March 1995

"The Slovak Republic, pursuant to article 21 of the [said Convention] recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention."

"The Slovak Republic further declares, pursuant to article 22 of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

SLOVENIA

"1. The Republic of Slovenia declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture, pursuant to article 21 of the said Convention, to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

2. The Republic of Slovenia also declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture, pursuant to article 22 of the said Convention, to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

SOUTH AFRICA

"The Republic of South Africa declares that:

(a) it recognises, for the purposes of article 21 of the Convention, the competence of the Committee Against Torture to receive and consider communications that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention;

(b) it recognises, for the purposes of article 22 of the Convention, the competence of the Committee Against Torture to receive and consider communications from, or on behalf of individuals who claim to be victims of torture by a State Party.

SPAIN

Spain declares that, pursuant to article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention, it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that the Spanish State is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention. It is Spain's understanding that, pursuant to the above-mentioned article, such communications shall be accepted and processed only if they come from a State Party which has made a similar declaration.

Spain declares that, pursuant to article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention, it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications sent by, or on behalf of, persons subject to Spanish jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by the Spanish State of the provisions of the Convention. Such communications must be consistent with the provisions of the above-mentioned article and, in particular, of its paragraph 5.

SWEDEN

"Sweden recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

"Sweden recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

SWITZERLAND

(a) Pursuant to the Federal Decree of 6 October 1986 on the approval of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the Federal Council declares, in accordance with article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention, that Switzerland recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that Switzerland is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

(b) Pursuant to the above-mentioned Federal Decree, the Federal Council declares, in accordance with article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention, that Switzerland recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by Switzerland of the provisions of the Convention.

TOGO

The Government of the Republic of Togo recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Togo recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

TUNISIA

[The Government of Tunisia] declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee Against Torture provided for in article 17 of the Convention to receive communications pursuant to articles 21 and 22, thereby withdrawing any reservation made on Tunisia's behalf in this connection.

TURKEY

"The Government of Turkey declares, pursuant to article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention that it recognizes the competence of the Committee Against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention.

The Government of Turkey declares, pursuant to article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention that it recognizes the competence of the Committee Against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

UGANDA

19 December 2001

"In accordance with Article 21 of the Convention, the Government of the Republic of Uganda declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications submitted by another State party, provided that such other State Party has made a declaration under Article 21 recognizing the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications in regard to itself."

UKRAINE[15]

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"The Government of the United Kingdom declares under article 21 of the said Convention that it recognizes the competence of the Committee Against Torture to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party, provided that such other State Party has, not less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a communication in regard to the United Kingdom, made a declaration under article 21 recognizing the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications in regard to itself."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"The United States declares, pursuant to article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention. It is the understanding of the United States that, pursuant to the above-mentioned article, such communications shall be accepted and processed only if they come from a State Party which has made a similar declaration."

URUGUAY

27 July 1988

The Government of Uruguay recognizes the competence of the Committee Against Torture to receive and consider communications referring to the said articles [21 and 22].

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

26 April 1994

"The Government of the Republic of Venezuela recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture as provided for under articles 21 and 22 of the Convention."

Notes:

[1] Including the provisions of articles 21 and 22 concerning the competence of the Committee against Torture, more than five States having, prior to that date, declared that they recognized the competence of the Committee against Torture, in accordance with the said articles.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly of the United Nations, Thirty-ninth session, Supplement No. 51* (A/39/51), p. 197.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 7 April 1986 and 9 September 1987, respectively, with the following reservations and declaration:

Reservations:

The German Democratic Republic declares in accordance with article 28, paragraph 1 of the Convention that it does not recognize the competence of the Committee provided for in article 20.

The German Democratic Republic declares in accordance with article 30, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of this article.

Declaration:

The German Democratic Republic declares that it will bear its share only of those expenses in accordance with article 17, paragraph 7, and article 18, paragraph 5, of the Convention arising from activities under the competence of the Committee as recognized by the German Democratic Republic.

In this regard, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declared, in a letter accompanying its instrument of ratification, the following:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland has taken note of the reservations formulated by the Government of the German Democratic Republic pursuant to article 28, paragraph 1, and article 30, paragraph 2, respectively, and the declaration made by the German Democratic Republic with reference to article 17, paragraph 7, and article 18, paragraph 5. It does not regard the said declaration as affecting in any way the obligations of the German Democratic Republic as a State Party to the Convention (including the obligations to meet its share of the expenses of the Committee on Torture as apportioned by the first meeting of the States Parties held on 26 November 1987 or any subsequent such meetings) and do not accordingly raise objections to it. It reserves the rights of the United Kingdom in their entirety in the event that the said declaration should at any future time be claimed to affect the obligations of th German Democratic Republic as aforesaid."

Moreover, the Secretary-General had received from the following States, objections to the declaration made by the German Democratic Republic, on the dates indicated hereinafter:

France (23 June 1988) :

France makes an objection to [the declaration] which it considers contrary with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The said objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between France and the German Democratic Republic.

Luxembourg (9 September 1988):

The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg objects to this declaration, which it deems to be a reservation the effect of which would be to inhibit activities of the Committee in a manner incompatible with the purpose and the goal of the Convention.

The present objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg and the German Democratic Republic.

Sweden (28 September 1988):

"According to article 2, paragraph 1 (d) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties a unilateral statement, whereby a State e.g. when ratifying a treaty purports to exclude the legal effect of certain provisions of the Treaty in their application, is regarded as a reservation. Thus, such unilateral statements are considered as reservations regardless of their name or phrase. The Government of Sweden has come to the conclusion that the declaration made by the German Democratic Republic is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and therefore is invalid according to article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. For this reason the Government of Sweden objects to this declaration."

Austria (29 September 1988):

"The Declaration [. . .] cannot alter or modify, in any respect, the obligations arising from that Convention for all States Parties thereto."

Denmark (29 September 1988):

"The Government of Denmark hereby enters its formal objction to [the declaration] which it considers to be a unilateral statement with the purpose of modifying the legal effect of certain provisions of the Convention against Torture, and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment in their application to the German Democratic Republic. It is the position of the Government of Denmark that the said declaration has no legal basis in the Convention or in international treaty law.

"This objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between Denmark and the German Democratic Republic."

Norway (29 September 1988):

"The Government of Norway cannot accept this declaration entered by the German Democratic Republic. The Government of Norway considers that any such declaration is without legal effect, and cannot in any manner diminish the obligation of a government to contribute to the costs of the Committee in conformity with the provisions of the Convention."

Canada (5 October 1988):

The Government of Canada considers that this declaration is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention against Torture, and thus inadmissible under article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. Through its functions and its activities, the Committee against Torture plays an essential role in the execution of the obligations of States parties to the Convention against Torture. Any restriction whose effect is to hamper the activities of the Committee would thus be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Greece (6 October 1988):

The Hellenic Republic raises an objection to [the declaration], which it considers to be in violation of article 19, paragraph (b), of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. The Convention against Torture expressly sets forth in article 28, paragraph 1, and article 30, paragraph 2, the reservations which may be made. The declaration of the German Democratic Republic is not, however, in conformity with these specified reservations.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the said Convention as between the Hellenic Republic and the German Democratic Republic.

Spain (6 October 1988):

. . . The Government of the Kingdom of Spain feels that such a reservation is a violation of article 19, paragraph (b), of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969, because the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment sets forth, in article 28, paragraph 1, and article 30, paragraph 2, the only reservations that may be made to the Convention, and the above-mentioned reservation of the German Democratic Republic does not conform to either of those reservations.

Switzerland (7 October 1988):

. . . That reservation is contrary to the purpose and aims of the Convention which are, through the Committee's activities, to encourage respect for a vitally important human right and to enhance the effectiveness of the struggle against torture the world over. This objection does not have the effect of preventing the Convention from entering into force between the Swiss Confederation and the German Democratic Republic.

Italy (12 January 1989) :

The Convention authorizes only the reservations indicated in article 28 (1) and 30 (2). The reservation made by the German Democratic Republic is not therefore admissible under the terms of article 19 (b) of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Portugal (9 February 1989):

". . . The Government of Portugal considers that this declaration is incompatible with the object and purpose of the present Convention. This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Portugal and G.D.R."

Australia (8 August 1989):

"The Government of Australia considers that this declaration is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and, accordingly, hereby conveys Australia's objetion to the declaration."

Finland (20 October 1989):

". . . The Government of Finland considers that any such declaration is without legal effect, and cannot in any manner diminish the obligation of a government to contribute to the costs of the Committee in conformity with the provisions of the Convention."

New Zealand (10 December 1989):

". . . The Government of New Zealand considers that this declaration is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between New Zealand and the German Democratic Republic."

Netherlands (21 December 1989):

"This declaration, clearly a reservation according to article 2, paragraph 1, under (d), of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, not only "purports to exclude or modify the legal effect" of articles 17, paragraph 7, and 18, paragraph 5, of the present Convention in their application to the German Democratic Republic itself, but it would also affect the obligations of the other States Parties which would have to pay additionally in order to ensure the proper functioning of the Committee Against Torture. For this reason the reservation is not acceptable to the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

"Thus, the assessment of the financial contributions of the States Parties to be made under article 17, paragraph 7, and article 18, paragraph 5, must be drawn up in disregard of the declaration of the German Democratic Republic."

Subsequently, in a communication received on 13 September 1990, the Government of the German Democratic Republic notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservations, made upon ratification, to articles 17 (7), 18 (5), 20 and 30 (1) of the Convention.

Further, the Government of the German Democratic Republic made the following declaration in respect of articles 21 and 22 of the Convention:

"The German Democratic Republic declares in accordance with article 21, paragraph 1, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

"The German Democratic Republic in accordance with article 22, paragraph 1, declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 18 April 1989 and 10 September 1991, respectively, with the following declaration:

"Yugoslavia recognizes, in compliance with article 21, paragraph 1 of the Convention, the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications in which one State Party to the Convention claims that another State Party does not fulfil the obligations pursuant to the Convention;

"Yugoslavia recognizes, in conformity with article 22, paragraph 1 of the Convention, the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", "Slovenia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] On 15 June 1999, the Governement of Portugal notified the Secretary-General that the Convention would apply to Macao.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Macao from China and Portgual (see note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portugal" regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with the reservation made by China will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[6] On 10 June 1997, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from the Governments of China and the United Kingdom (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with the reservation made by China will also apply to the Hong Kong special Administrative Region.

[7] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 8 September 1986 and 7 July 1988, respectively, with the following reservations:

"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound, in accordance with Article 30, paragraph 2, by the provisions of Article 30, paragraph 1, of the Convention."

"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not recognize the competence of the Committee against Torture as defined by article 20 of the Convention."

Subsequently, on 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation with respect to article 30 (1).

On 17 March 1995 and 3 September 1996, respectively, the Governments of Slovakia and the Czech Republic notified the Secretary-General that they had decided to withdraw the reservation with respect to article 20 made by Czechoslovakia upon signature, and confirmed upon ratification.

See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume

[8] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

[11] For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Anguilla, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands (Malvinas), Gibraltar, Montserrat, Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands, Saint Helena, Saint Helena Dependencies, and Turks and Caicos Islands.

In this connection, on 14 April 1989, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following objection:

The Government of Argentina reaffirms its sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands, which form part of its national territory, and, with regard to the Malvinas Islands, formally objects to and rejects the declaration of territorial extension issued by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in the instrument of ratification of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 8 December 1988.

The General Assembly of the United Nations adopted resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12 and 39/6 in which it recognizes the existence of a sovereignty dispute regarding the question of the Malvinas Islands and has repeatedly requested the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to resume negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful and definitive solution to the dispute and their remaining differences relating to that question, through the good offices of the Secretary-General. The General Assembly also adopted resolutions 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25, which request the parties to initiate negotiations with a view to finding the means to resolve peacefully and definitively the problems pending between both countries, including all aspects on the future of the Malvinas Islands.

Subsequently, on 17 April 1991, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following declaration:

The Argentine Government rejects the extension of the application of the [said] Convention to the Malvinas Islands, effected by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on 8 December 1988, and reaffirms the rights of sovereignty of the Argentine Republic over those Islands, which are an integral part of its national territory.

The Argentine Republic recalls that the United Nations General Assembly has adopted resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25, in which it recognizes the existence of a sovereignty dispute and requests the Governments of the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to initiate negotiations with a view to finding the means to resolve peacefully and definitively the pending questions of sovereignty, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

On 9 December 1992, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General that the Convention applies to the Bailiwick of Guernsey, the Bailiwick of Jersey, the Isle of Man, Bermuda and Hong Kong *(see also note 4)* .

[12] On 3 June 1994, the Secretary-General received a communication from the Government of the United States of America requesting, in compliance with a condition set forth by the Senate of the United States of America, in giving advice and consent to the ratification of the Convention, and in contemplation of the deposit of an instrument of ratification of the Convention by the Government of the United States of America, that a notification should be made to all present and prospective ratifying Parties to the Convention to the effect that:

"... nothing in this Convention requires or authorizes legislation, or other action, by the United States of America prohibited by the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the United States."

[13] On 4 August 1998, the Government Bahrain withdrew the following reservation to article 20 made upon accession:

1. The State of Bahrain does not recognize the competence of the Committee for which provision is made in article 20 of the Convention.

[14] In this regard, the Secretary-General received communications from the following Governments on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Germany (17 December 1999):

“The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany notes that the said declaration constitutes a reservation of a general nature. A reservation according to which article 14 paragraph 1 of the Convention will only be applied by the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh "in consonance with the existing laws and legislation in the country" raises doubts as to the full commitment of Bangladesh to the object and purpose of the Convention. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become Parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all Parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the Convention. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the People's Republic of Bangladesh".

Netherlands (20 December 1999):

“The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that such a reservation, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention by invoking national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of this State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties should be respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Bangladesh.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into foofConvention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Bangladesh".

[15] In communications received on 8 March 1989, 19 and 20 April 1989 respectively, the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic notified the Secretary-General that they had decided to withdraw the reservations concerning article 30 (1) made upon ratification. The reservation made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which is identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis* , as the one made by the other two Governments, reads as follows:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 30 of the Convention.

Subsequently, on 1 October 1991, 3 October 2001, and 12 September 2003, respectively, the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Belarus and Ukraine notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the following reservation with regard to article 20 made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification. The reservation made by Belarus, which is identical in essence, mutatis mutandis, as the one made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, reads as follows:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not recognize the competence of the Committee against Torture as defined by article 20 of the Convenant.

On 12 September 2003, Ukraine not only had decided to withdraw the reservation under article 20 but also the declarations made under articles 21 and 22 whic read as follows:

“.....Ukraine has decided to withdraw the reservations concerning Article 20 of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, which was adopted at New York on 10 December 1984, made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification thereof.

Ukraine fully recognizes extension to its territory of Article 21 of the 1984 Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment as regards recognition of the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

Ukraine fully recognizes extension to its territory of Article 22 of the 1984 Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment as regards recognition of the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to jurisdiction of a State Party who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

Ukraine declares that the provisions of Articles 20, 21 and 22 of the 1984 Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment shall extend to cases which may arise as from the date of receipt by the UN Secretary General of the notification concerning the withdrawal of reservations and relevant declarations of Ukraine."

[16] On 24 June 1992 and 25 June 1999, respectively, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservations to article 30 (1) and 20, made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1465, p. 198.

[17] In a communication received on 7 September 1990, the Government of Chile notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the declaration made by virtue of article 28 (1) upon signature and confirmed upon ratification by which the Government did not recognize the competence of the Committee against torture as defined by article 20 of the Convention. The Government of Chile further decided to withdraw the following reservations, made upon ratification, to article 2 (3) and article 3, of the Convention:

(a) [To] Article 2, paragraph 3, in so far as it modifies the principle of "obedience upon reiteration" contained in Chilean domestic law. The Government of Chile will apply the provisions of that international norm to subordinate personnel governed by the Code of Military Justice, provided that the order patently intended to lead to perpetration of the acts referred to in article 1 is not insisted on by the superior officer after being challenged by his subordinate.

(b) Article 3, by reason of the discretionary and subjective nature of the terms in which it is drafted.

It will be recalled that the Secretary-General had received various objections to the said declarations from the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Italy (14 August 1989):

The Government of Italy considers that the reservations entered by Chile are not valid, as they are incompatible with the objection and purpose of the Convention. The present objection is in no way an obstacle to the entry into force of this Convention between Italy and Chile.

Denmark (7 September 1989):

"The Danish Government considers the said reservations as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and therefore invalid.

"This objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between Denmark and Chile."

Luxembourg (12 September 1989):

. . . The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg objects to the reservations, which are incompatible with the intent and purpose of the Convention.

This objection does not represent an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg and Chile.

Czechoslovakia (20 September 1989):

"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic considers the reservations of the Government of Chile [. . .] as incompatible with the object and purpose of this Convention.

"The obligation of each State to prevent acts of torture in any territory under its jurisdiction is unexceptional. It is the obligation of each State to ensure that all acts of torture are offences under its criminal law. This obligation is confirmed, *inter alia* , in article 2, paragraph 3 of the Convention concerned.

"The observance of provisions set up in article 3 of this Convention is necessitated by the need to ensure more effective protection for persons who might be in danger of being subjected to torture and this is obviously one of the principal purposes of the Convention.

"Therefore, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not recognize these reservations as valid."

France (20 September 1989):

France considers that the reservations made by Chile are not valid as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Such objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between France and Chile.

Sweden (25 September 1989):

". . . These reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and therefore are impermissible according to article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. For this reason the Government of Sweden objects to these reservations. This objection does not have the effect of preventing the Convention from entering into force between Sweden and Chile, and the said reservations cannot alter or modify, in any respect, the obligations arising from the Convention."

Spain (26 September 1989):

. . . The aforementioned reservations are contrary to the purposes and aims of the Convention.

The present objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Spain and Chile.

Norway (28 September 1989):

". . . The Government of Norway considers the said reservations as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and therefore invalid.

"This objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between Norway and Chile."

Portugal (6 October 1989):

". . .The Government of Portugal considers such reservations to be incompatible with the object and purpose of this Convention and therefore invalid.

"This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Portugal and Chile."

Greece (13 October 1989):

Greece does not accept the reservations since they are incompatible with the purpose and object of the Convention.

The above-mentioned objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Greece and Chile.

Finland (20 October 1989):

". . . The Government of Finland considers the said reservations as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and therefore invalid.

"This objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between Finland and Chile."

Canada (23 October 1989):

"The reservations by Chile are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention Against Torture and thus inadmissible under article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties."

Turkey (3 November 1989):

"The Government of Turkey considers such reservations to be incompatible with the object and purpose of this Convention and therefore invalid.

"This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Turkey and Chile."

Australia (7 November 1989):

"[The Government of Australia] has come to the conclusion that these reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and therefore are impermissible according to article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. The Government of Australia therefore objects to these reservations. This objection does not have the effect of preventing the Convention from entering into force between Australia and Chile, and the afore-mentioned reservations cannot alter or modify, in any respect, the obligations arising from the Convention."

Netherlands (7 November 1989):

"Since the purpose of the Convention is strengthening of the existing prohibition of torture and similar practices the reservation to article 2, paragraph 3, to the effect to an order from a superior officer or a public authority may - in some cases - be invoked as a justification of torture, must be rejected as contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention.

"For similar reasons the reservation to article 3 must be regarded as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

"These objections are not an obstacle to the entry into force of this Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Chile."

Switzerland (8 November 1989):

These reservations are not compatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, which are to improve respect for human rights of fundamental importance and to make more effective the struggle against torture throughout the world.

This objection does not have the effect of preventing the Convention from entering into force between the Swiss Confederation and the Republic of Chile.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (8 Novem- ber 1989):

"The United Kingdom is unable to accept the reservation to article 2, paragraph 3, or the reservation to article 3."

In the same communication, the Government of the United Kingdom notified the Secretary-General of the following:

"(a) The reservations to article 28, paragraph 1, and to article 30, paragraph 1, being reservations expressly permitted by the Convention, do not call for any observations by the United Kingdom.

"(b) The United Kingdom takes note of the reservation referring to the Inter-American Convention to Prevent and Punish Torture, which cannot, however, affect the obligations of Chile in respect of the United Kingdom, as a non-Party to the said Convention."

Austria (9 November 1989):

"The reservations [. . .] are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and are therefore impermissible under article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. The Republic of Austria therefore objects against these reservations and states that they cannot alter or modify, in any respect, the obligations arising from the Convention for all States Parties thereto."

New Zealand (10 December 1989):

". . . The New Zealand Government considers the said reservations to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between New Zealand and Chile."

Bulgaria (24 January 1990):

"The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers the reservations made by Chile with regard to art. 2, para. 3 and art. 3 of the Convention against torture and other forms of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment of December 10, 1984 incompatible with the object and the purpose of the Convention.

"The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria holds the view that each State is obliged to take all measures to prevent any acts of torture and other forms of cruel and inhuman treatment within its jurisdiction, including the unconditional qualification of such acts as crimes in its national criminal code. It is in this sense that art. 2, para. 3 of the Convention is formulated.

"The provisions of art. 3 of the Convention are dictated by the necessity to grant the most effective protection to persons who risk to suffer torture or other inhuman treatment. For this reasn these provisions should not be interpreted on the basis of subjective or any other circumstances, under which they were formulated.

"In view of this the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria does not consider itself bound by the reservations."

Further, in a communication received on 3 September 1999, the Government of Chile withdrew the following reservation made upon ratification:

The Government of Chile will not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 30, paragraph 1 of the Convention.

[18] In a communication received on 30 May 1990, the Government of Guatemala notified the Secretary-General that it has decided to withdraw the reservations made by virtue of the provisions of articles 28 (1) and 30 (2), made upon accession to the Convention.

[19] In a communication received on 13 September 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it has decided to withdraw the following reservations relating to articles 20 and 30 (1) made upon ratification:

The Hungarian People's Republic does not recognize the competence of the Committee against Torture as defined by article 20 of the Convention.

The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 30 of the Convention.

[20] On 19 October 2006, the Government of Morocco notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made regarding article 20, made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification. The reservation reads as follows:

The Government of the Kingdom of Morocco does not recognize the competence of the Committee provided for in article 20.

[21] The Secretary-General received communications relating to the reservation made by Qatar upon accession from the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Italy (5 February 2001) :

"The Government of the Italian Republic has examined the reservation to the Convention against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment made by the Government of Qatar. The Government of the Italian Republic believes that the reservation concerning the compatibility of the rules of the Convention with the precepts of the Islamic law and the Islamic Religion raises doubts as the commitment of Qatar to fulfill its obligations under the Convention. The Government of the Italian Republic considers this reservation to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention according to article 19 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. This reservation does not fall within the rule of article 20, paragraph 5 and can be objected anytime.

Therefore, the Government of the Italian Republic objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Qatar to the Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Italy and Qatar."

Demark (21 February 2001) :

"The Government of Denmark has examined the contents of the reservation made by the Government of Qatar to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment regarding any interpretation of the provisions of the Convention that is incompatible with the precepts of Islamic law and the Islamic religion. The Government of Denmark considers that the reservation, which is of a general nature, is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and raises doubts as to the commitment of Qatar to fulfil her obligations under the Convention. It is the opinion of the Government of Denmark that no time limit applies to objections against reservations which are inadmissible under international law.

For the above-mentioned reasons, the Government of Denmark objects to this reservation made by the Government of Qatar. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Qatar and Denmark."

Portugal (20 July 2001) :

"The Government of the Portuguese Republic has examined the reservation made by the Government of Qatar to the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (New York, 10 December 1984), whereby it excludes any interpretation of the said Convention which would be incompatible with the precepts of Islamic Law and the Islamic Religion.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic is of the view that this reservation goes against the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a State party to a treaty may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform according to the obligations set out by the said treaty, creating legitimate doubts on its commitment to the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermine the basis of International Law.

Furthermore, the said reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic wishes, therefore, to express its disagreement with the reservation made by the Government of Qatar."

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (9 November 2001):

"The Government of the United Kingdom have examined the reservation made by the Government of Qatar on 11 January 2000 in respect of the Convention, which reads as follows:

'.....with reservation as to: (a) Any interpretation of the provisions of the Convention that is incompatible with the precepts of Islamic law and the Islamic religion.'

The Government of the United Kingdom note that a reservation which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention theent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the reservation made by the Government of Qatar.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Qatar."

[22] On 26 February 1996, the Government of Germany notified the Secretary-General that with respect to the reservations under I (1) and understandings under II (2) and (3) made by the United States of America upon ratification "it is the understanding of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany that [the said reservations and understandings] do not touch upon the obligations of the United States of America as State Party to the Convention.".

[23] In a notification received on 19 February 1999, the Government of Zambia informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation to article 20 of the Convention, made upon accession. The text of the reservation reads as follows:

"With a reservation on article 20."

9. a) Amendments to articles 17 (7) and 18 (5) of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

New York, 8 September 1992

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 29 of the Convention which reads as follows: "1. Any State Party to this Convention may propose an amendment and file it with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The Secretary-General shall thereupon communicate the proposed amendment to the States Parties with a request that they notify him whether they favor a conference of States parties for the purpose of considering and voting upon the proposal. In the event that within four months from the date of such communication at least one third of the States Parties favours such a conference, the Secretary-General shall convene the conference under the auspices of the United Nations. Any amendment adopted by a majority of the States Parties present and voting at the conference shall be submitted by the Secretary-General to all the States Parties for acceptance. 2. An amendment adopted in accordance with paragraph 1 of this article shall enter into force when two thirds of the States Parties to this Convention have notified the Secretary-General of the United Nations that they have accepted it in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. 3. When amendments enter into force, they shall be binding on those States Parties which have accepted them, other States Parties still being bound by the provisions of this Convention and any earlier amendments which they have accepted.".

STATUS: Parties: 28.

TEXT: Doc. CAT/sp/1992/L.1.

Note: The amendments were proposed by the Government of Australia and circulated by the Secretary-General under cover of depositary notification C.N.10.1992.TREATIES-1 of 28 February 1992, in accordance with article 29 (1) of the Convention. The Conference of the States Parties convened by the Secretary-General in accordance with article 29 (1) adopted, on 8 September 1992, the amendments which were subsequently endorsed by the General Assembly in resolution 47/111[1] of 16 December 1992.

Participant	*Acceptance(A)*
Australia	15 Oct 1993 A
Bulgaria	2 Mar 1995 A
Canada	8 Feb 1995 A
China	10 Jul 2002 A
Colombia	1 Sep 1999 A
Cyprus	22 Feb 1994 A
Denmark	3 Sep 1993 A
Ecuador	6 Sep 1995 A
Finland	5 Feb 1993 A
France	24 May 1994 A
Germany	8 Oct 1996 A
Iceland	23 Oct 1996 A
Liberia	16 Sep 2005 A
Liechtenstein	24 Aug 1994 A
Luxembourg	31 Jan 2005 A
Mexico	15 Mar 2002 A
Netherlands[2]	24 Jan 1995 A
New Zealand	8 Oct 1993 A
Norway	6 Oct 1993 A
Philippines	27 Nov 1996 A
Poland	23 Mar 2009 A
Portugal	17 Apr 1998 A
Seychelles	23 Jul 1993 A
Spain	5 May 1999 A
Sweden	14 May 1993 A
Switzerland	10 Dec 1993 A
Ukraine	17 Jun 1994 A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	7 Feb 1994 A

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly of the United Nations, Forty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 49 (A/47/49)*, p. 192.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

9. b) Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

New York, 18 December 2002

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	22 June 2006, in accordance with article 28(1)which reads as follows: "1. The present Protocol shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the twentieth instrument of ratification or accession. 2. For each State ratifying the present Protocol or acceding to it after the deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the twentieth instrument of ratification or accession, the present Protocol shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit of its own instrument of ratification or accession.".
REGISTRATION:	22 June 2006, No. 24841.
STATUS:	Signatories: 62. Parties: 46.
TEXT:	GA Resolution A/RES/57/199 of 9 January 2003.

Note: The above Protocol was adopted on 18 December 2002 at the fifty-seventh session of the General Assembly of the United Nations by resolution A/RES/57/199. In accordance with article 27 (1), the Protocol was opened for signature on 4 February 2003, the first possible date, by any State that has signed the Convention. In accordance with operative paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution A/RES/57/199, the Protocol is available for signature, ratification and accession at United Nations Headquarters in New York.

Participant	*Signature, Succession to signature(d)*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Albania		1 Oct 2003 a
Argentina	30 Apr 2003	15 Nov 2004
Armenia		14 Sep 2006 a
Austria	25 Sep 2003	
Azerbaijan	15 Sep 2005	28 Jan 2009
Belgium	24 Oct 2005	
Benin	24 Feb 2005	20 Sep 2006
Bolivia	22 May 2006	23 May 2006
Bosnia and Herzegovina	7 Dec 2007	24 Oct 2008
Brazil	13 Oct 2003	12 Jan 2007
Burkina Faso	21 Sep 2005	
Cambodia	14 Sep 2005	30 Mar 2007
Chile	6 Jun 2005	12 Dec 2008
Congo	29 Sep 2008	
Costa Rica	4 Feb 2003	1 Dec 2005
Croatia	23 Sep 2003	25 Apr 2005
Cyprus	26 Jul 2004	
Czech Republic	13 Sep 2004	10 Jul 2006
Denmark[1]	26 Jun 2003	25 Jun 2004
Ecuador	24 May 2007	
Estonia	21 Sep 2004	18 Dec 2006
Finland	23 Sep 2003	
France	16 Sep 2005	11 Nov 2008
Gabon	15 Dec 2004	
Georgia		9 Aug 2005 a
Germany	20 Sep 2006	4 Dec 2008
Ghana	6 Nov 2006	
Guatemala	25 Sep 2003	9 Jun 2008
Guinea	16 Sep 2005	
Honduras	8 Dec 2004	23 May 2006
Iceland	24 Sep 2003	
Ireland	2 Oct 2007	
Italy	20 Aug 2003	
Kazakhstan	25 Sep 2007	22 Oct 2008
Kyrgyzstan		29 Dec 2008 a
Lebanon		22 Dec 2008 a
Liberia		22 Sep 2004 a
Liechtenstein	24 Jun 2005	3 Nov 2006
Luxembourg	13 Jan 2005	
Madagascar	24 Sep 2003	
Maldives	14 Sep 2005	15 Feb 2006
Mali	19 Jan 2004	12 May 2005
Malta	24 Sep 2003	24 Sep 2003
Mauritius		21 Jun 2005 a
Mexico	23 Sep 2003	11 Apr 2005
Montenegro[2]	23 Oct 2006 d	6 Mar 2009
Netherlands	3 Jun 2005	
New Zealand[3]	23 Sep 2003	14 Mar 2007
Nicaragua	14 Mar 2007	25 Feb 2009
Norway	24 Sep 2003	
Paraguay	22 Sep 2004	2 Dec 2005
Peru		14 Sep 2006 a
Poland	5 Apr 2004	14 Sep 2005
Portugal	15 Feb 2006	
Republic of Moldova	16 Sep 2005	24 Jul 2006

Participant	Signature, Succession to signature(d)	Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)
Romania	24 Sep 2003	
Senegal	4 Feb 2003	18 Oct 2006
Serbia	25 Sep 2003	26 Sep 2006
Sierra Leone	26 Sep 2003	
Slovenia		23 Jan 2007 a
South Africa	20 Sep 2006	
Spain	13 Apr 2005	4 Apr 2006
Sweden	26 Jun 2003	14 Sep 2005
Switzerland	25 Jun 2004	
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	1 Sep 2006	13 Feb 2009
Timor-Leste	16 Sep 2005	
Togo	15 Sep 2005	
Turkey	14 Sep 2005	
Ukraine	23 Sep 2005	19 Sep 2006
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	26 Jun 2003	10 Dec 2003
Uruguay	12 Jan 2004	8 Dec 2005

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AZERBAIJAN

Declaration:

"The Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it is unable to guarantee the application of the provisions of the Protocol in the territories occupied by the Republic of Armenia until these territories are liberated from occupation."

BELGIUM

Declaration made upon signature: This signature also engages the French community, the Flemish community, the German-speaking community and the Waloon region.

FRANCE

Declaration:

Pursuant to articles 15 and 21 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, no French authority or official shall order, apply, permit or tolerate any sanction against any person or organization for having communicated to the Subcommittee on Prevention or to its delegates or to the national preventive mechanism any information, whether true or false, and no such person or organization shall be otherwise prejudiced in any way, provided that, in the case of false information, the person or organization in question was unaware of the false nature of the information at the time of its communication and, moreover, without prejudice to the legal remedies that persons who are implicated may invoke for harm suffered as a result of the communication of false information about them.

GERMANY

Declaration:

"The distribution of competences within the Federal Republic of Germany means that a treaty between the Länder (federal states), which requires parliamentary approval, is needed in order to establish the national preventive mechanism at Länder level. Because of this requirement, Germany shall postpone the implementation of its obligations under Part IV of the Optional Protocol. The Subcommittee will be informed as soon as possible of the date from which the national prevention mechanism is operational."

MONTENEGRO

Declaration:

"The Government of Montenegro makes the following Declaration in relation to article 24 of the Optional Protocol:

In accordance with the article 24 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment Montenegro postpones the implementation of its obligations under part IV of the present Optional Protocol for two years after the date of the entrance into force of the Optional Protocol."

Notifications made under article 17
(Unless otherwise indicated, the notifications were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AZERBAIJAN

"The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Azerbaijan…..has the honour to inform that the Commissioner of the Human Rights (Ombudsman) of the Republic of Azerbaijan was designated by the Decree of the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan No. 112, dated January 13, 2009 as the national preventive mechanism according to Article 17 of the (United Nations) Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment."

SLOVENIA

"In accordance with Article 17 of the Protocol, the Republic of Slovenia declares herewith that the competencies and duties of the national preventive mechanism will be performed by the Human Rights

Ombudsperson and in agreement with him/her also by non-governmental organisations registered in the Republic of Slovenia and by organisations, which acquired the status of humanitarian organisations in the Republic of Slovenia."

THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

"In accordance with Article 17 of the Protocol, the Republic of Macedonia declares that the Ombudsman of the Republic of Macedonia is designated as a national preventive mechanism for the prevention of torture at the domestic level.

The non-governmental organizations registered in the Republic of Macedonia and organizations which have acquired the status of humanitarian organizations in the Republic of Macedonia, may perform some of the competences of the national preventive mechanism, in agreement with, and with prior consent of the Ombudsman of the Republic of Macedonia."

Notes:

[1] With a territorial exclusion in respect of the Faroe Islands.

Subsequently, on 29 August 2005, the Government of Denmark informed the Secretary-General of the following:

"... that Denmark withdraws its declaration made upon ratification of the said Protocol to the effect that until further notice the Optional Protocol should not apply to the Faroe Islands."

[2] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] With a territorial exclusion with regard to the Tokelau Islands, with the following:

"... consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand to the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, this ratification shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory."

10. INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AGAINST APARTHEID IN SPORTS

New York, 10 December 1985

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	3 April 1988, in accordance with article 18(1).
REGISTRATION:	3 April 1988, No. 25822.
STATUS:	Signatories: 72. Parties: 60.
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1500, p. 161.

Note: The Convention was adopted by resolution 40/64 G[1]of 10 December 1985 at the fortieth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Acceptance(A), Approval(AA), Succession(d)*
Algeria	16 May 1986	27 Oct 1988
Angola		9 Aug 1990 a
Antigua and Barbuda	28 May 1986	9 Sep 1987
Bahamas	20 May 1986	13 Nov 1986
Barbados	16 May 1986	2 Oct 1986
Belarus	16 May 1986	1 Jul 1987
Benin	16 May 1986	
Bolivia	16 May 1986	27 Apr 1988
Bosnia and Herzegovina[3]		1 Sep 1993 d
Bulgaria	10 Jun 1986	18 Aug 1987
Burkina Faso	16 May 1986	29 Jun 1988
Burundi	16 May 1986	
Cameroon	21 Mar 1988	
Cape Verde	16 May 1986	
Central African Republic	16 May 1986	
China	21 Oct 1987	
Colombia	31 Jul 1986	
Croatia[3]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba	16 May 1986	11 Dec 1990
Cyprus	9 Jul 1987	
Czech Republic[4]		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic Republic of the Congo	16 May 1986	
Ecuador	16 May 1986	12 Jun 1991
Egypt	16 May 1986	2 Apr 1991
Equatorial Guinea		27 Mar 1987 a
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Ethiopia	16 May 1986	22 Jul 1987
Gabon	16 May 1986	
Ghana	16 May 1986	24 Mar 1988
Guinea	16 May 1986	10 Oct 1989
Guinea-Bissau	16 May 1986	
Guyana	1 Oct 1986	1 Oct 1986
Haiti	16 May 1986	
Hungary	25 Jun 1986	
India		12 Sep 1990 a
Indonesia	16 May 1986	23 Jul 1993
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 May 1986	12 Jan 1988
Iraq		30 Jan 1989 a
Jamaica	16 May 1986	2 Oct 1986
Jordan	16 May 1986	26 Aug 1987
Kenya	16 May 1986	
Kuwait		28 Aug 1998 a
Kyrgyzstan		19 Jul 2005 a
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 a
Lebanon	7 Nov 1986	
Liberia	2 May 1986	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	16 May 1986	29 Jun 1988
Madagascar	16 May 1986	
Malaysia	16 May 1986	
Maldives	3 Oct 1986	
Mali		7 Feb 1989 a
Mauritania	18 Jan 1988	13 Dec 1988
Mauritius		26 Jun 1990 a
Mexico	16 May 1986	18 Jun 1987
Mongolia	16 May 1986	16 Dec 1987 AA
Montenegro[5]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	16 May 1986	
Nepal	24 Jun 1986	1 Mar 1989
Nicaragua	16 May 1986	
Niger	27 May 1986	2 Sep 1986
Nigeria	16 May 1986	20 May 1987

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Acceptance(A), Approval(AA), Succession(d)*
Panama	16 May 1986	
Peru	30 May 1986	7 Jul 1988
Philippines	16 May 1986	27 Jul 1987
Poland	16 May 1986	4 Mar 1988
Qatar	3 Dec 1987	19 Jan 1988
Russian Federation	16 May 1986	11 Jun 1987
Rwanda	16 May 1986	
Senegal	16 May 1986	15 Oct 1986
Serbia[3]		12 Mar 2001 d
Sierra Leone	16 May 1986	
Somalia	4 Jun 1986	
St. Kitts and Nevis	16 May 1986	5 Dec 1988
St. Lucia	29 May 1987	
Sudan	16 May 1986	23 Feb 1990
Syrian Arab Republic	16 Mar 1986	28 Nov 1988
Togo	29 May 1986	23 Apr 1987
Trinidad and Tobago	21 May 1986	11 Oct 1990
Tunisia	16 May 1986	25 Sep 1989
Uganda	16 May 1986	29 Aug 1986
Ukraine	16 May 1986	19 Jun 1987
United Republic of Tanzania	16 May 1986	13 Jan 1989
Uruguay	28 May 1986	26 Jan 1988
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	16 May 1986	3 Oct 1989
Yemen[6]	16 May 1986	
Zambia	10 Feb 1988	8 Mar 1988
Zimbabwe	16 May 1986	14 Jul 1987

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession.)

CUBA

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba considers, with respect to the provisions of article 19 of the Convention, that any dispute arising between Parties should be resolved by direct negotiations through the diplomatic channel.

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly of the United Nations, Fortieth session,* Supplement No. 53 (A/40/53), p. 37.

[2] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 16 May 1986 and 15 September 1986, respectively. See also note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 16 May 1986 and 22 December 1989, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 25 February 1987 and 29 July 1987, respectively. See also note 1 under “Czech Republic” and note 1 under “Slovakia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The formality was effected by Democratic Yemen. See also note 1 under “Yemen” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume

11. CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD

New York, 20 November 1989

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	2 September 1990, in accordance with article 49(1).
REGISTRATION:	2 September 1990, No. 27531.
STATUS:	Signatories: 140. Parties: 193.
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1577, p. 3; depositary notifications C.N.147.1993.TREATIES-5 of 15 May 1993 [amendments to article 43 (2)][1]; and C.N.322.1995.TREATIES-7 of 7 November 1995 [amendment to article 43 (2)].

Note: The Convention, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, was adopted by resolution 44/25[2] of 20 November 1989 at the Forty-fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Convention is open for signature by all States at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance(A), Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Afghanistan	27 Sep 1990	28 Mar 1994
Albania	26 Jan 1990	27 Feb 1992
Algeria	26 Jan 1990	16 Apr 1993
Andorra	2 Oct 1995	2 Jan 1996
Angola	14 Feb 1990	5 Dec 1990
Antigua and Barbuda	12 Mar 1991	5 Oct 1993
Argentina	29 Jun 1990	4 Dec 1990
Armenia		23 Jun 1993 a
Australia	22 Aug 1990	17 Dec 1990
Austria	26 Aug 1990	6 Aug 1992
Azerbaijan		13 Aug 1992 a
Bahamas	30 Oct 1990	20 Feb 1991
Bahrain		13 Feb 1992 a
Bangladesh	26 Jan 1990	3 Aug 1990
Barbados	19 Apr 1990	9 Oct 1990
Belarus	26 Jan 1990	1 Oct 1990
Belgium	26 Jan 1990	16 Dec 1991
Belize	2 Mar 1990	2 May 1990
Benin	25 Apr 1990	3 Aug 1990
Bhutan	4 Jun 1990	1 Aug 1990
Bolivia	8 Mar 1990	26 Jun 1990
Bosnia and Herzegovina[3]		1 Sep 1993 d
Botswana		14 Mar 1995 a
Brazil	26 Jan 1990	24 Sep 1990
Brunei Darussalam		27 Dec 1995 a
Bulgaria	31 May 1990	3 Jun 1991
Burkina Faso	26 Jan 1990	31 Aug 1990
Burundi	8 May 1990	19 Oct 1990
Cambodia		15 Oct 1992 a
Cameroon	25 Sep 1990	11 Jan 1993
Canada	28 May 1990	13 Dec 1991
Cape Verde		4 Jun 1992 a
Central African Republic	30 Jul 1990	23 Apr 1992
Chad	30 Sep 1990	2 Oct 1990
Chile	26 Jan 1990	13 Aug 1990
China[4,5]	29 Aug 1990	2 Mar 1992
Colombia	26 Jan 1990	28 Jan 1991
Comoros	30 Sep 1990	22 Jun 1993
Congo		14 Oct 1993 a
Cook Islands		6 Jun 1997 a
Costa Rica	26 Jan 1990	21 Aug 1990
Côte d'Ivoire	26 Jan 1990	4 Feb 1991
Croatia[3]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba	26 Jan 1990	21 Aug 1991
Cyprus	5 Oct 1990	7 Feb 1991
Czech Republic[6]		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	23 Aug 1990	21 Sep 1990
Democratic Republic of the Congo	20 Mar 1990	27 Sep 1990
Denmark[7]	26 Jan 1990	19 Jul 1991
Djibouti	30 Sep 1990	6 Dec 1990
Dominica	26 Jan 1990	13 Mar 1991
Dominican Republic	8 Aug 1990	11 Jun 1991
Ecuador	26 Jan 1990	23 Mar 1990
Egypt[8]	5 Feb 1990	6 Jul 1990
El Salvador	26 Jan 1990	10 Jul 1990
Equatorial Guinea		15 Jun 1992 a
Eritrea	20 Dec 1993	3 Aug 1994
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Ethiopia		14 May 1991 a
Fiji	2 Jul 1993	13 Aug 1993

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance(A), Accession(a), Succession(d)
Finland	26 Jan 1990	20 Jun 1991
France	26 Jan 1990	7 Aug 1990
Gabon	26 Jan 1990	9 Feb 1994
Gambia	5 Feb 1990	8 Aug 1990
Georgia		2 Jun 1994 a
Germany[9]	26 Jan 1990	6 Mar 1992
Ghana	29 Jan 1990	5 Feb 1990
Greece	26 Jan 1990	11 May 1993
Grenada	21 Feb 1990	5 Nov 1990
Guatemala	26 Jan 1990	6 Jun 1990
Guinea		13 Jul 1990 a
Guinea-Bissau	26 Jan 1990	20 Aug 1990
Guyana	30 Sep 1990	14 Jan 1991
Haiti	26 Jan 1990	8 Jun 1995
Holy See	20 Apr 1990	20 Apr 1990
Honduras	31 May 1990	10 Aug 1990
Hungary	14 Mar 1990	7 Oct 1991
Iceland	26 Jan 1990	28 Oct 1992
India		11 Dec 1992 a
Indonesia	26 Jan 1990	5 Sep 1990
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	5 Sep 1991	13 Jul 1994
Iraq		15 Jun 1994 a
Ireland	30 Sep 1990	28 Sep 1992
Israel	3 Jul 1990	3 Oct 1991
Italy	26 Jan 1990	5 Sep 1991
Jamaica	26 Jan 1990	14 May 1991
Japan	21 Sep 1990	22 Apr 1994
Jordan	29 Aug 1990	24 May 1991
Kazakhstan	16 Feb 1994	12 Aug 1994
Kenya	26 Jan 1990	30 Jul 1990
Kiribati		11 Dec 1995 a
Kuwait	7 Jun 1990	21 Oct 1991
Kyrgyzstan		7 Oct 1994 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		8 May 1991 a
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 a
Lebanon	26 Jan 1990	14 May 1991
Lesotho	21 Aug 1990	10 Mar 1992
Liberia	26 Apr 1990	4 Jun 1993
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		15 Apr 1993 a
Liechtenstein	30 Sep 1990	22 Dec 1995
Lithuania		31 Jan 1992 a
Luxembourg	21 Mar 1990	7 Mar 1994
Madagascar	19 Apr 1990	19 Mar 1991
Malawi		2 Jan 1991 a
Malaysia		17 Feb 1995 a
Maldives	21 Aug 1990	11 Feb 1991
Mali	26 Jan 1990	20 Sep 1990
Malta	26 Jan 1990	30 Sep 1990
Marshall Islands	14 Apr 1993	4 Oct 1993
Mauritania	26 Jan 1990	16 May 1991
Mauritius		26 Jul 1990 a
Mexico	26 Jan 1990	21 Sep 1990
Micronesia (Federated States of)		5 May 1993 a
Monaco		21 Jun 1993 a
Mongolia	26 Jan 1990	5 Jul 1990
Montenegro[10]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	26 Jan 1990	21 Jun 1993
Mozambique	30 Sep 1990	26 Apr 1994
Myanmar		15 Jul 1991 a
Namibia	26 Sep 1990	30 Sep 1990
Nauru		27 Jul 1994 a
Nepal	26 Jan 1990	14 Sep 1990
Netherlands[11]	26 Jan 1990	6 Feb 1995 A
New Zealand[12]	1 Oct 1990	6 Apr 1993
Nicaragua	6 Feb 1990	5 Oct 1990
Niger	26 Jan 1990	30 Sep 1990
Nigeria	26 Jan 1990	19 Apr 1991
Niue		20 Dec 1995 a
Norway	26 Jan 1990	8 Jan 1991
Oman		9 Dec 1996 a
Pakistan	20 Sep 1990	12 Nov 1990
Palau		4 Aug 1995 a
Panama	26 Jan 1990	12 Dec 1990
Papua New Guinea	30 Sep 1990	2 Mar 1993
Paraguay	4 Apr 1990	25 Sep 1990
Peru	26 Jan 1990	4 Sep 1990
Philippines	26 Jan 1990	21 Aug 1990
Poland	26 Jan 1990	7 Jun 1991
Portugal[4]	26 Jan 1990	21 Sep 1990
Qatar	8 Dec 1992	3 Apr 1995
Republic of Korea	25 Sep 1990	20 Nov 1991
Republic of Moldova		26 Jan 1993 a
Romania	26 Jan 1990	28 Sep 1990

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance(A), Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Russian Federation	26 Jan 1990	16 Aug 1990
Rwanda	26 Jan 1990	24 Jan 1991
Samoa	30 Sep 1990	29 Nov 1994
San Marino		25 Nov 1991 a
Sao Tome and Principe		14 May 1991 a
Saudi Arabia		26 Jan 1996 a
Senegal	26 Jan 1990	31 Jul 1990
Serbia[3]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		7 Sep 1990 a
Sierra Leone	13 Feb 1990	18 Jun 1990
Singapore		5 Oct 1995 a
Slovakia[6]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[3]		6 Jul 1992 d
Solomon Islands		10 Apr 1995 a
Somalia	9 May 2002	
South Africa	29 Jan 1993	16 Jun 1995
Spain	26 Jan 1990	6 Dec 1990
Sri Lanka	26 Jan 1990	12 Jul 1991
St. Kitts and Nevis	26 Jan 1990	24 Jul 1990
St. Lucia	30 Sep 1990	
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	20 Sep 1993	26 Oct 1993
Sudan	24 Jul 1990	3 Aug 1990
Suriname	26 Jan 1990	1 Mar 1993
Swaziland	22 Aug 1990	7 Sep 1995
Sweden	26 Jan 1990	29 Jun 1990
Switzerland	1 May 1991	24 Feb 1997
Syrian Arab Republic	18 Sep 1990	15 Jul 1993
Tajikistan		26 Oct 1993 a
Thailand		27 Mar 1992 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[3,13]		2 Dec 1993 d
Timor-Leste		16 Apr 2003 a
Togo	26 Jan 1990	1 Aug 1990
Tonga		6 Nov 1995 a
Trinidad and Tobago	30 Sep 1990	5 Dec 1991
Tunisia	26 Feb 1990	30 Jan 1992
Turkey	14 Sep 1990	4 Apr 1995
Turkmenistan		20 Sep 1993 a
Tuvalu		22 Sep 1995 a
Uganda	17 Aug 1990	17 Aug 1990
Ukraine	21 Feb 1990	28 Aug 1991
United Arab Emirates		3 Jan 1997 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[5,14]	19 Apr 1990	16 Dec 1991
United Republic of Tanzania	1 Jun 1990	10 Jun 1991
United States of America	16 Feb 1995	
Uruguay	26 Jan 1990	20 Nov 1990
Uzbekistan		29 Jun 1994 a
Vanuatu	30 Sep 1990	7 Jul 1993
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	26 Jan 1990	13 Sep 1990
Viet Nam	26 Jan 1990	28 Feb 1990
Yemen[15]	13 Feb 1990	1 May 1991
Zambia	30 Sep 1990	6 Dec 1991
Zimbabwe	8 Mar 1990	11 Sep 1990

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, accession or succession.)

AFGHANISTAN

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"The Government of the Republic of Afghanistan reserves the right to express, upon ratifying the Convention, reservations on all provisions of the Convention that are incompatible with the laws of Islamic Shari'a and the local legislation in effect."

ALGERIA

Interpretative declarations:

Article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2:

The provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 14 shall be interpreted by the Algerian Government in compliance with the basic foundations of the Algerian legal system, in particular:

- With the Constitution, which stipulates in its article 2 that Islam is the State religion and in its article 35 that "there shall be no infringement of the inviolability of the freedom of conviction and the inviolability of the freedom of opinion";
- With Law No. 84-11 of 9 June 1984, comprising the Family Code, which stipulates that a child's education is to take place in accordance with the religion of its father.

Articles 13, 16 and 17:

Articles 13, 16 and 17 shall be applied while taking account of the interest of the child and the need to safeguard its physical and mental integrity. In this framework, the Algerian Government shall interpret the provisions of these articles while taking account of:

- The provisions of the Penal Code, in particular those sections relating to breaches of public order, to public decency and to the incitement of minors to immorality and debauchery;

- The provisions of Law No. 90-07 of 3 April 1990, comprising the Information Code, and particularly its article 24 stipulating that "the director of a publication destined for children must be assisted by an educational advisory body";

- Article 26 of the same Code, which provides that "national and foreign periodicals and specialized publications, whatever their nature or purpose, must not contain any illustration, narrative, information or insertion contrary to Islamic morality, national values or human rights or advocate racism, fanaticism and treason. Further, such publications must contain no publicity or advertising that may promote violence and delinquency."

ANDORRA[16]

Declarations:

A.- The Principality of Andorra deplores the fact that the [said Convention] does not prohibit the use of children in armed conflicts. It also disagrees with the provisions of article 38, paragraphs 2 and 3, concerning the participation and recruitment of children from the age of 15.

...

ARGENTINA

Reservation and declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

Reservation:

The Argentine Republic enters a reservation to subparagraphs (b), (c), (d) and (e) of article 21 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and declares that those subparagraphs shall not apply in areas within its jurisdiction because, in its view, before they can be applied a strict mechanism must exist for the legal protection of children in matters of inter-country adoption, in order to prevent trafficking in and the sale of children.

Declarations:

Concerning article 1 of the Convention, the Argentine Republic declares that the article must be interpreted to the effect that a child means every human being from the moment of conception up to the age of eighteen.

Concerning article 38 of the Convention, the Argentine Republic declares that it would have liked the Convention categorically to prohibit the use of children in armed conflicts. Such a prohibition exists in its domestic law which, by virtue of article 41 of the Convention, it shall continue to apply in this regard.

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

Concerning subparagraph (f) of article 24 of the Convention, the Argentine Republic considers that questions relating to family planning are the exclusive concern of parents in accordance with ethical and moral principles and understands it to be a State obligation, under this article, to adopt measures providing guidance for parents and education for responsible parenthood.

AUSTRALIA

Reservation:

"Australia accepts the general principles of article 37. In relation to the second sentence of paragraph (c), the obligation to separate children from adults in prison is accepted only to the extent that such imprisonment is considered by the responsible authorities to be feasible and consistent with the obligation that children be able to maintain contact with their families, having regard to the geography and demography of Australia. Australia, therefore, ratifies the Convention to the extent that it is unable to comply with the obligation imposed by article 37 (c)."

AUSTRIA

Reservations:

"1. Article 13 and article 15 of the Convention will be applied provided that they will not affect legal restrictions in accordance with article 10 and article 11 of the European Convention on the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 4 November 1950.

"2. Article 17 will be applied to the extent that it is compatible with the basic rights of others, in particular with the basic rights of freedom of information and freedom of press."

Declarations:

"1. Austria will not make any use of the possibility provided for in article 38, paragraph 2, to determine an age limit of 15 years for taking part in hostilities as this rule is incompatible with article 3, paragraph 1, which determines that the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration.

"2. Austria declares, in accordance with its constitutional law, to apply article 38, paragraph 3, provided that only male Austrian citizens are subject to compulsory military service."

BAHAMAS

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The Government of the Commonwealth of The Bahamas upon signing the Convention reserves the right not to apply the provisions of article 2 of the said Convention insofar as those provisions relate to the conferment of citizenship upon a child having regard to the Provisions of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of The Bahamas".

BANGLADESH[17]

Reservations:

"[The Government of Bangladesh] ratifies the Convention with a reservation to article 14, paragraph 1.

"Also article 21 would apply subject to the existing laws and practices in Bangladesh."

BELGIUM

Interpretative declarations:

1. With regard to article 2, paragraph 1, according to the interpretation of the Belgian Government non-discrimination on grounds of national origin does not necessarily imply the obligation for States automatically to guarantee foreigners the same rights as their nationals. This concept should be understood as designed to rule out all arbitrary conduct but not differences in treatment based on objective and reasonable considerations, in accordance with the principles prevailing in democratic societies.

2. Articles 13 and 15 shall be applied by the Belgian Government within the context of the provisions and limitations set forth or authorized by said Convention in articles 10 and 11 of the European Convention for the

Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 4 November 1950.

3. The Belgian Government declares that it interprets article 14, paragraph 1, as meaning that, in accordance with the relevant provisions of article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 19 December 1966 and article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 4 November 1950, the right of the child to freedom of thought, conscience and religion implies also the freedom to choose his or her religion or belief.

4. With regard to article 40, paragraph 2 (b) (v), the Belgian Government considers that the expression "according to law" at the end of that provision means that:

(a) This provision shall not apply to minors who, under Belgian law, are declared guilty and are sentenced in a higher court following an appeal against their acquittal in a court of the first instance;

(b) This provision shall not apply to minors who, under Belgian law, are referred directly to a higher court such as the Court of Assize.

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA[18]

"....."

BOTSWANA[19]

Reservation:

"The Government of the Republic of Botswana enters a reservation with regard to the provisions of article 1 of the Convention and does not consider itself bound by the same in so far as such may conflict with the Laws and Statutes of Botswana."

BRUNEI DARUSSALAM[20,21,22]

Reservation:

"[The Government of Brunei Darussalam] expresses its reservations on the provisions of the said Convention which may be contrary to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islam, the State, religion, and without prejudice to the generality of the said reservations, in particular expresses its reservation on articles 14, 20 and 21 of the Convention."

CANADA

Reservations:

"(i) Article 21

With a view to ensuring full respect for the purposes and intent of article 20 (3) and article 30 of the Convention, the Government of Canada reserves the right not to apply the provisions of article 21 to the extent that they may be inconsistent with customary forms of care among aboriginal peoples in Canada.

"(ii) Article 37 (c)

The Government of Canada accepts the general principles of article 37 (c) of the Convention, but reserves the right not to detain children separately from adults where this is not appropriate or feasible.

Statement of understanding:

"Article 30:

It is the understanding of the Government of Canada that, in matters relating to aboriginal peoples of Canada, the fulfilment of its responsibilities under article 4 of the Convention must take into account the provisions of article 30. In particular, in assessing what measures are appropriate to implement the rights recognized in the Convention for aboriginal children, due regard must be paid to not denying their right, in community with other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practice their own religion and to use their own language."

CHINA

Reservation:

[T]he People's Republic of China shall fulfil its obligations provided by article 6 of the Convention under the prerequisite that the Convention accords with the provisions of article 25 concerning family planning of the Constitution of the People's Republic of China and in conformity with the provisions of article 2 of the Law of Minor Children of the People's Republic of China.

COLOMBIA

Upon signature:

The Colombian Government considers that, while the minimum age of 15 years for taking part in armed conflicts, set forth in article 38 of the Convention, is the outcome of serious negotiations which reflect various legal, political and cultural systems in the world, it would have been preferable to fix that age at 18 years in accordance with the principles and norms prevailing in various regions and countries, Colombia among them, for which reason the Colombian Government, for the purpose of article 38 of the Convention, shall construe the age in question to be 18 years.

Upon ratification:

Reservation:

The Government of Colombia, pursuant to article 2, paragraph 1 (d) of the Convention, declares that for the purposes of article 38, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Convention, the age referred to in said paragraphs shall be understood to be 18 years, given the fact that, under Colombian law, the minimum age for recruitment into the armed forces of personnel called for military service is 18 years.

COOK ISLANDS

Reservations:

"The Government of the Cook Islands reserves the right not to apply the provisions of article 2 in so far as those provisions may relate to the conferment of Cook Islands nationality, citizenship or permanent residency upon a child having regard to the Constitution and other legislation as may from time to time be in force in the Cook Islands.

With respect to article 10, the Government of the Cook Islands reserves the right to apply such legislation, in so far as it relates to the entry into, stay in and departure from the Cook Islands of those who do not have the right under the law of the Cook Islands to enter and remain in the Cook Islands, and to the acquisition and possession of citizenship, as it may deem necessary from time to time.

The Government of the Cook Islands accepts the general principles of article 37. In relation to the second sentence of paragraph (c), the obligation to separate children from adults in prison is accepted only to the extent that such imprisonment is considered by the responsible authorities to be feasible. The Cook Islands reserves the right not to apply article 37 in so far as those provisions require children who are detained to be accommodated separately from adults.

Declarations:

Domestically, the Convention does not apply directly. It establishes State obligations under international law that the Cook Islands fulfils in accordance with its national law.

Article 2 paragraph (1) does not necessarily imply the obligation of States automatically to guarantee foreigners the same rights as their nationals. The concept of non-discrimination on the basis of national origin should be understood as designed to rule out all arbitrary conduct but not differences in treatment based on objective and reasonable considerations, in accordance with the principles prevailing in democratic societies.

The Government of the Cook Islands will take the opportunity afforded by its accession to the Convention to initiate reforms in its domestic legislation relating to adoption that are in keeping with the spirit of the Convention and that it considers appropriate, in line with article 3 (2) of the Convention to ensure the well-being of the child. While all adoptions now permitted under Cook Islands law are based on the principle of the best interest of the child being of paramount consideration and authorised by the High Court in accordance with applicable law and procedures and on the basis of all pertinent and reliable information, the principal aim of the planned measures will be to remove vestigial discrimination provisions governing adoptions found in legislation enacted with respect to the Cook Islands prior to the acquisition of sovereignty by the Cook Islands in order to ensure non-discriminatory adoption arrangements for all Cook Islands nationals."

CROATIA[23]

Reservation:

"The Republic of Croatia reserves the right not to apply paragraph 1 of article 9 of the Convention since the internal legislation of the Republic of Croatia provides for the right of competent authorities (Centres for Social Work) to determine on separation of a child from his/her parents without a previous judicial review."

CUBA

Declaration:

With reference to article 1 of the Convention, the Government of the Republic of Cuba declares that in Cuba, under the domestic legislation in force, majority is not attained at 18 years of age for purposes of the full exercise of civic rights.

CZECH REPUBLIC[6]

DENMARK[7]

Reservations:

"Article 40, paragraph 2 (b) (v) shall not be binding on Denmark.

"It is a fundamental principle of the Danish Administration of Justice Act that everybody shall be entitled to have any penal measures imposed on him or her by a court of first instance reviewed by a higher court. There are, however, some provisions limiting this right in certain cases, for instance verdicts returned by a jury on the question of guilt, which have not been reversed by the legally trained judges of the court."

DJIBOUTI[17,19,24]

Declaration:

[The Government of Djibouti] shall not consider itself bound by any provisions or articles that are incompatible with its religion and its traditional values.

ECUADOR[25]

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"In signing the Convention on the Rights of the Child, Ecuador reaffirms . . . [that it is] especially pleased with the ninth preambular paragraph of the draft Convention, which pointed to the need to protect the unborn child, and believed that that paragraph should be borne in mind in interpreting all the articles of the Convention, particularly article 24. While the minimum age set in article 38 was, in its view, too low, [the Government of Ecuador] did not wish to endanger the chances for the Convention's adoption by consensus and therefore would not propose any amendment to the text."

EGYPT[8]

FRANCE

Declarations and reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

(1) The Government of the French Republic declares that this Convention, particularly article 6, cannot be interpreted as constituting any obstacle to the implementation of the provisions of French legislation relating to the voluntary interruption of pregnancy.

(2) The Government of the Republic declares that, in the light of article 2 of the Constitution of the French Republic, article 30 is not applicable so far as the Republic is concerned.

(3) The Government of the Republic construes article 40, paragraph 2 (b) (v), as establishing a general principle to which limited exceptions may be made under law. This is particularly the case for certain non-appealable offences tried by the Police Court and for offences of a criminal nature. None the less, the decisions handed down by the final court of jurisdiction may be appealed before the Court of Cassation, which shall rule on the legality of the decision taken.

GERMANY[9,26]

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany reserves the right to make, upon ratification, such declarations as it considers necessary, especially with regard to the interpretation of articles 9, 10, 18 and 22."

Upon ratification:

Declarations:

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares . . . that it will take the opportunity afforded by the ratification of the Convention to initiate reforms in its domestic legislation that are in keeping with the spirit of the Convention and that it considers appropriate, in line with article 3 (2) of the Convention, to ensure the well-being of the child. The planned measures include, in particular, a revision of the law on parental custody in respect of children whose parents have not married, are permanently living apart while still married, or are divorced. The principal aim will be to improve the conditions for the exercise of parental custody by both parents in such cases as well. The Federal Republic of Germany also declares that domestically the Convention does not apply directly. It establishes state obligations under international law that the Federal Republic of Germany fulfils in accordance with its national law, which conforms with the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that article 18 (1) of the Convention does not imply that by virtue of the entry into force of this provision parental custody, automatically and without taking into account the best interests of the respective child, applies to both parents even in the case of children whose parents have not married, are permanently living apart while still married, or are divorced. Such an interpretation would be incompatible with article 3 (1) of the Convention. The situation must be examined in a case-by-case basis, particularly where the parents cannot agree on the joint exercise of custody.

The Federal Republic of Germany therefore declares that the provisions of the Convention are also without prejudice to the provisions of national law concerning

a) legal representation of minors in the exercise of their rights;

b) rights of custody and access in respect of children born in wedlock;

c) circumstances under family and inheritance law of children born out of wedlock;

This applies irrespective of the planned revision of the law on parental custody, the details of which remain within the discretion of the national legislator.

Reservations:

In accordance with the reservations made by it with respect to the parallel guarantees of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Federal Republic of Germany declares in respect of article 40 (2) (b) (ii) and (v) of the Convention that these provisions shall be applied in such a way that, in the case of minor infringement of the penal law, there shall not in each and every case exist:

a) a right to have "legal or other appropriate assistance" in the preparation and presentation of the defence, and/or

b) an obligation to have a sentence not calling for imprisonment reviewed by a "higher competent authority or judicial body".

Declarations:

Nothing in the Convention may be interpreted as implying that unlawful entry by an alien into the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany or his unlawful stay there is permitted; nor may any provision be interpreted to mean that it restricts the right of the Federal Republic of Germany to pass laws and regulations concerning the entry of aliens and the conditions of their stay or to make a distinction between nationals and aliens.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany regrets the fact that under article 38 (2) of the Convention even fifteen-year-olds may take a part in hostilities as soldiers, because this age limit is incompatible with the consideration of a child's best interest (article 3 (1) of the Convention). It declares that it will not make any use of the possibility afforded by the Convention of fixing this age limit at fifteen years.

GUATEMALA

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"The State of Guatemala is signing this Convention out of a humanitarian desire to strengthen the ideals on which the Convention is based, and because it is an instrument which seeks to institutionalize, at the global level, specific norms for the protection of children, who, not being legally of age, must be under the guardianship of the family, society and the State.

"With reference to article 1 of the Convention, and with the aim of giving legal definition to its signing of the Convention, the Government of Guatemala declares that article 3 of its Political Constitution establishes that: "The State guarantees and protects human life from the time of its conception, as well as the integrity and security of the individual."

HOLY SEE

Reservations:

"a) [The Holy See] interprets the phrase `Family planning education and services' in article 24.2, to mean only those methods of family planning which it considers morally acceptable, that is, the natural methods of family planning.

"b) [The Holy See] interprets the articles of the Convention in a way which safeguards the primary and inalienable rights of parents, in particular insofar as these rights concern education (articles 13 and 28), religion (article 14), association with others (article 15) and privacy (article 16).

"c) [The Holy See declares] that the application of the Convention be compatible in practice with the particular nature of the Vatican City State and of the sources of its objective law (art. 1, Law of 7 June 1929, n. 11) and, in consideration of its limited extent, with its legislation in the matters of citizenship, access and residence."

Declaration:

"The Holy See regards the present Convention as a proper and laudable instrument aimed at protecting the rights and interests of children, who are 'that precious treasure given to each generation as a challenge to its wisdom and humanity' (Pope John Paul II, 26 April 1984).

"The Holy See recognizes that the Convention represents an enactment of principles previously adopted by the United Nations, and once effective as a ratified instrument, will safeguard the rights of the child before as well as after birth, as expressly affirmed in the `Declaration of the Rights of the Child' [Res. 136 (XIV)] and restated in the ninth preambular paragraph of the Convention. The Holy See remains confident that the ninth preambular paragraph will serve as the perspective through which the rest of the Convention will be interpreted, in conformity with article 31 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969.

"By acceding to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Holy See intends to give renewed expression to its constant concern for the well-being of children and families. In consideration of its singular nature and position, the Holy See, in acceding to this Convention, does not intend to prescind in any way from its specific mission which is of a religious and moral character."

ICELAND

Declarations:

"1. With respect to article 9, under Icelandic law the administrative authorities can take final decisions in some cases referred to in the article. These decisions are subject to judicial review in the sense that it is a principle of Icelandic law that courts can nullify administrative decisions if they conclude that they are based on unlawful premises. This competence of the courts to review administrative decisions is based on article 60 of the Constitution.

"2. With respect to article 37, the separation of juvenile prisoners from adult prisoners is not obligatory under Icelandic law. However, the law relating to prisons and imprisonment provides that when deciding in which penal institution imprisonment is to take place account should be taken of, *inter alia* , the age of the prisoner. In light of the circumstances prevailing in Iceland it is expected that decisions on the imprisonment of juveniles will always take account of the juvenile's best interest."

INDIA

Declaration:

"While fully subscribing to the objectives and purposes of the Convention, realising that certain of the rights of child, namely those pertaining to the economic, social and cultural rights can only be progressively implemented in the developing countries, subject to the extent of available resources and within the framework of international co-operation; recognising that the child has to be protected from exploitation of all forms including economic exploitation; noting that for several reasons children of different ages do work in India; having prescribed minimum ages for employment in hazardous occupations and in certain other areas; having made regulatory provisions regarding hours and conditions of employment; and being aware that it is not practical immediately to prescribe minimum ages for admission to each and every area of employment in India - the Government of India undertakes to take measures to progressively implement the provisions of article 32, particularly paragraph 2 (a), in accordance with its national legislation and relevant international instruments to which it is a State Party."

INDONESIA[22,24]

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)[19,27]

Upon signature:

Reservation:

"The Islamic Republic of Iran is making reservation to the articles and provisions which may be contrary to the Islamic Shariah, and preserves the right to make such particular declaration, upon its ratification".

Upon ratification:

Reservation:

"The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran reserves the right not to apply any provisions or articles of the Convention that are incompatible with Islamic Laws and the international legislation in effect."

IRAQ

Reservation:

The Government of Iraq has seen fit to accept [the Convention] ... subject to a reservation in respect to article 14, paragraph 1, concerning the child's freedom of religion, as allowing a child to change his or her religion runs counter to the provisions of the *Islamic Shariah* .

IRELAND

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"Ireland reserves the right to make, when ratifying the Convention, such declarations or reservations as it may consider necessary."

JAPAN

Reservation:

"In applying paragraph (c) of article 37 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, Japan reserves the right not to be bound by the provision in its second sentence, that is, `every child deprived of liberty shall be separated from adults unless it is considered in the child's best interest not to do so', considering the fact that in Japan as regards persons deprived of liberty, those who are below twenty years of age are to be generally separated from those who are of twenty years of age and over under its national law."

Declarations:

1. The Government of Japan declares that paragraph 1 of article 9 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child be interpreted not to apply to a case where a child is separated from his or her parents as a result of deportation in accordance with its immigration law.

2. The Government of Japan declares further that the obligation to deal with applications to enter or leave a State Party for the purpose of family re-unification `in a positive, humane and expeditious manner' provided for in paragraph 1 of article 10 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child be interpreted not to affect the outcome of such applications."

JORDAN[28]

Reservation:

The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan expresses its reservation and does not consider itself bound by articles 14, 20 and 21 of the Convention, which grant the child the right to freedom of choice of religion and concern the question of adoption, since they are at variance with the precepts of the tolerant Islamic Shariah.

KIRIBATI[22]

Reservation:

"In respect of article 24 paragraphs (b,c,d,e and f), article 26 and article 28 paragraphs (b,c and d), in accordance with article 51 paragraph 1 of the Convention.

Declaration:

The Republic of Kiribati considers that a child's rights as defined in the Convention, in particular the rights defined in articles 12-16 shall be exercised with respect for parental authority, in accordance with the Kiribati customs and traditions regarding the place of the child within and outside the family."

KUWAIT

Upon signature:

Reservation:

"[Kuwait expresses] reservations on all provisions of the Convention that are incompatible with the laws of Islamic Shari'a and the local statutes in effect."

Upon ratification:

Declarations:

Article 7:

The State of Kuwait understands the concepts of this article to signify the right of the child who was born in Kuwait and whose parents are unknown (parentless) to be granted the Kuwaiti nationality as stipulated by the Kuwaiti Nationality Laws.

Article 21:

The State of Kuwait, as it adheres to the provisions of the Islamic shariah as the main source of legislation, strictly bans abandoning the Islamic religion and does not therefore approve adoption.

LIECHTENSTEIN[29]

Declaration concerning article 1:

"According to the legislation of the Principality of Liechtenstein children come of age with 20 years. However, the Liechtenstein law provides for the possibility to prolong or to shorten the duration of minority."

Reservation concerning article 7:

"The Principality of Liechtenstein reserves the right to apply the Liechtenstein legislation according to which Liechtenstein nationality is granted under certain conditions."

Reservation concerning article 10:

"The Principality of Liechtenstein reserves the right to apply the Liechtenstein legislation according to which family re-unification for certain categories of foreigners is not guarantied."

LUXEMBOURG

Reservations:

1. The Government of Luxembourg believes that it is in the interest of families and children to maintain the provision of article 334-6 of the Civil Code, which reads as follows:

Article 334-6 . If at the time of conception, the father or mother was bound in marriage to another person, the natural child may be raised in the conjugal home only with the consent of the spouse of his parent.

2. The Government of Luxembourg declares that the present Convention does not require modification of the legal status of children born to parents between whom marriage is absolutely prohibited, such status being warranted by the interest of the child, as provided under article 3 of the Convention.

3. The Government of Luxembourg declares that article 6 of the present Convention presents no obstacle to implementation of the provisions of Luxembourg legislation concerning sex information, the prevention of back-street abortion and the regulation of pregnancy termination.

4. The Government of Luxembourg believes that article 7 of the Convention presents no obstacle to the legal process in respect of anonymous births, which is deemed to be in the interest of the child, as provided under article 3 of the Convention.

5. The Government of Luxembourg declares that article 15 of the present Convention does not impede the provisions of Luxembourg legislation concerning the capacity to exercise rights.

MALAYSIA[30]

Reservation:

"The Government of Malaysia accepts the provisions of the Convention on the Rights of the Child but expresses reservations with respect to articles 1, 2, 7, 13, 14, 15, [...], 28, [paragraph 1 (a)] 37, [...] of the Convention and declares that the said provisions shall be applicable only if they are in conformity with the Constitution, national laws and national policies of the Government of Malaysia."

23 March 1999

Declaration:

With respect to article 28 paragraph 1 (a), the Government of Malaysia wishes to declare that in Malaysia, even though primary education is not compulsory and available free to all, primary education is available to everybody and Malaysia has achieved a high rate of enrolment for primary education i.e. at the rate of 98% enrolment."

MALDIVES

Upon signature:

Reservations:

"1) Since the Islamic Shariah is one of the fundamental sources of Maldivian Law and since Islamic Shariah does not include the system of adoption among the ways and means for the protection and care of children contained in Shariah, the Government of the Republic of Maldives expresses its reservation with respect to all the clauses and provisions relating to adoption in the said Convention on the Rights of the Child.

"2) The Government of the Republic of Maldives expresses its reservation to paragraph 1 of article 14 of the said Convention on the Rights of the Child, since the Constitution and the Laws of the Republic of Maldives stipulate that all Maldivians should be Muslims."

Upon ratification:

Reservations to articles 14 and 21.

MALI

Reservation:

The Government of the Republic of Mali declares that, in view of the provisions of the Mali Family Code, there is no reason to apply article 16 of the Convention.

MALTA[31]

MAURITANIA

Upon signature:

Reservation:

In signing this important Convention, the Islamic Republic of Mauritania is making reservations to articles or provisions which may be contrary to the beliefs and values of Islam, the religion of the Mauritania People and State.

MAURITIUS[32]

MONACO

Declaration:

The Principality of Monaco declares that this Convention, especially article 7, shall not affect the rules laid down in Monegasque legislation regarding nationality.

Reservation:

The Principality of Monaco interprets article 40, paragraph 2 (b)(v) as stating a general principle which has a number of statutory exceptions. Such, for example, is the case with respect to certain criminal offences. In any event, in all matters the Judicial Review Court rules definitively on appeals against all decisions of last resort.

MOROCCO[33]

Declarations:

The Government of the Kingdom of Morocco interprets the provisions of article 14, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Rights of the Child in the light of the Constitution of 7 October 1996 and the other relevant provisions of its domestic law, as follows:

Article 6 of the Constitution, which provides that Islam, the State religion, shall guarantee freedom of worship for all.

Article 54, paragraph 6, of Act 70-03 (the Family Code), which stipulates that parents owe their children the right to religious guidance and education based on good conduct.

By this declaration, the Kingdom of Morocco reaffirms its attachment to universally recognized human rights and its commitment to the purposes of the aforementioned Convention.

MYANMAR[17,34]

NETHERLANDS[11]

Reservations:

"Article 26:

The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the provisions of article 26 of the Convention with the reservation that these provisions shall not imply an independent entitlement of children to social security, including social insurance.

"Article 37:

The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the provisions of article 37 (c) of the Convention with the reservation that these provisions shall not prevent the application of adult penal law to children of sixteen years and older, provided that certain criteria laid down by law have been met.

"Article 40:

The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the provisions of article 40 of the Convention with the reservation that cases involving minor offences may be tried without the presence of legal assistance and that with respect to such offences the position remains that no provision is made in all cases for a review of the facts or of any measures imposed as a consequence."

Declarations:

"Article 14:

It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that article 14 of the Convention is in accordance with the provisions of article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 19 December 1966 and that this article shall include the freedom of a child to have or adopt a religion or belief of his or her choice as soon as the child is capable of making such choice in view of his or her age or maturity.

"Article 22:

With regard to article 22 of the Convention, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands declares:

a) that it understands the term "refugee" in paragraph 1 of this article as having the same meaning as in article 1 of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees of 28 July 1951; and

b) that it is of the opinion that the obligation imposed under the terms of this article does not prevent

- the submission of a request for admission from being made subject to certain conditions, failure to meet such conditions resulting in inadmissibility;
- the referral of a request for admission to a third State, in the event that such a State is considered to be primarily responsible for dealing with the request for asylum.

"Article 38

With regard to article 38 of the Convention, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands declares that it is of the opinion that States would not be allowed to involve children directly or indirectly in hostilities and that the minimum age for the recruitment or incorporation of children in the armed forces should be above fifteen years.

In times of armed conflict, provisions shall prevail that are most conducive to guaranteeing the protection of children under international law, as referred to in article 41 of the Convention."

NEW ZEALAND

Reservations:

Nothing in this Convention shall affect the right of the Government of New Zealand to continue to distinguish as it considers appropriate in its law and practice between persons according to the nature of their authority to be in New Zealand including but not limited to their entitlement to benefits and other protections described in the Convention, and the Government of New Zealand reserves the right to interpret and apply the Convention accordingly.

The Government of New Zealand considers that the rights of the child provided for in article 32 (1) are adequately protected by its existing law. It therefore reserves the right not to legislate further or to take additional measures as may be envisaged in article 32 (2).

The Government of New Zealand reserves the right not to apply article 37 (c) in circumstances where the shortage of suitable facilities makes the mixing of juveniles and adults unavoidable; and further reserves the right not to apply article 37 (c) where the interests of other juveniles in an establishment require the removal of a particular juvenile offender or where mixing is considered to be of benefit to the persons concerned.

NORWAY[35]

OMAN[36]

Reservations:

1. The words "or to public safety" should be added in article 9 [, paragraph 4,] after the words "unless the provision of the information would be detrimental to the well-being of the child.

2. A reservation is entered to all the provisions of the Convention that do not accord with Islamic law or the legislation in force in the Sultanate and, in particular, to the provisions relating to adoption set forth in its article 21.

3. The provisions of the Convention should be applied within the limits imposed by the material resources available.

4. The Sultanate considers that article 7 of the Convention as it relates to the nationality of a child shall be understood to mean that a child born in the Sultanate of unknown parents shall acquire Oman nationality, as stipulated in the Sultanate's Nationality Law.

5. The Sultanate does not consider itself to be bound by those provisions of article 14 of the Convention that accord a child the right to choose his or her religion or those of its article 30 that allow a child belonging to a religious minority to profess his or her own religion.

PAKISTAN[19,24]

POLAND

Reservations:

- With respect to article 7 of the Convention, the Republic of Poland stipulates that the right of an adopted child to know its natural parents shall be subject to the limitations imposed by binding legal arrangements that enable adoptive parents to maintain the confidentiality of the child's origin;
- The law of the Republic of Poland shall determine the age from which call-up to military or similar service and participation in military operations are permissible. That age limit may not be lower than the age limit set out in article 38 of the Convention.

Declarations:

- The Republic of Poland considers that a child's rights as defined in the Convention, in particular the rights defined in articles 12 to 16, shall be exercised with respect for parental authority, in accordance with Polish customs and traditions regarding the place of the child within and outside the family;
- With respect to article 24, paragraph 2 (f), of the Convention, the Republic of Poland considers that family planning and education services for parents should be in keeping with the principles of morality.

QATAR[17,19,36,37]

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

[The State of Qatar] enter(s) a general reservation by the State of Qatar concerning provisions incompatible with Islamic Law.

REPUBLIC OF KOREA[38]

Reservations:

The Republic of Korea considers itself not bound by the provisions of paragraph (a) of article 21 and sub-paragraph (b) (v) of paragraph 2 of article 40.

SAMOA

Reservation:

"The Government of Western Samoa whilst recognising the importance of providing free primary education as specified under article 28 (1)(a) of the Convention on the rights of the child

And being mindful of the fact that the greater portion of schools within Western Samoa that provide primary education are controlled by bodies outside the control of the government

Pursuant then to article 51, the Government of Western Samoa thus reserves the right to allocate resources to the primary level sector of education in Western Samoa in contrast to the requirement of article 28 (1)(a) to provide free primary education."

SAUDI ARABIA[21]

Reservation:

[The Government of Saudi Arabia enters] reservations with respect to all such articles as are in conflict with the provisions of Islamic law.

SERBIA[39]

SINGAPORE[22,40]

Declarations:

"(1) The Republic of Singapore considers that a child's rights as defined in the Convention, in particular the rights defined in article 12 to 17, shall in accordance with articles 3 and 5 be exercised with respect for the authority of parents, schools and other persons who are entrusted with the care of the child and in the best interests of the child and in accordance with the customs, values and religions of Singapore's multi-racial and multi-religious society regarding the place of the child within and outside the family.

(2) The Republic of Singapore considers that articles 19 and 37 of the Convention do not prohibit -

(a) the application of any prevailing measures prescribed by law for maintaining law and order in the Republic of Singapore;

(b) measures and restrictions which are prescribed by law and which are necessary in the interests of national security, public safety, public order, the protection of public health or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others; or

(c) the judicious application of corporal punishment in the best interest of the child.

Reservations:

(3) The Constitution and the laws of the Republic of Singapore provide adequate protection and fundamental rights and liberties in the best interests of the child. The accession to the Convention by the Republic of Singapore does not imply the acceptance of obligations going beyond the limits prescribed by the Constitution of the Republic of Singapore nor the acceptance of any obligation to introduce any right beyond those prescribed under the Constitution.

(4) Singapore is geographically one of the smallest independent countries in the world and one of the most densely populated. The Republic of Singapore accordingly reserves the right to apply such legislation and conditions concerning the entry into, stay in and departure from the Republic of Singapore of those who do not or who no longer have the right under the laws of the Republic ofSingapore, to enter and remain in the Republic of Singapore, and to the acquisition and possession of citizenship, as it may deem necessary from time to time and in accordance with the laws of the Republic of Singapore.

(5) The employment legislation of the Republic of Singapore prohibits the employment of children below 12 years old and gives special protection to working children between the ages of 12 years and below the age of 16 years. The Republic of Singapore reserves the right to apply article 32 subject to such employment legislation.

(6) With respect to article 28.1(a), the Republic of Singapore-

(a) does not consider itself bound by the requirement to make primary education compulsory because such a measure is unnecessary in our social context where in practice virtually all children attend primary school; and

(b) reserves the right to provide primary education free only to children who are citizens of Singapore."

SLOVAKIA[6]

SLOVENIA[41]

SPAIN

Declarations:

1. Spain understands that article 21, paragraph (d), of the Convention may never be construed to permit financial benefits other than those needed to cover strictly necessary expenditure which may have arisen from the adoption of children residing in another country.

2. Spain, wishing to make common cause with those States and humanitarian organizations which have manifested their disagreement with the contents of article 38, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Convention, also wishes to express its disagreement with the age limit fixed therein and to declare that the said limit appears insufficient, by permitting the recruitment and participation in armed conflict of children having attained the age of fifteen years.

SWAZILAND

Declaration:

"The Convention on the Rights of the Child being a point of departure to guarantee child rights; taking into consideration the progressive character of the implementation of certain social, economic and cultural rights; as recognized in article 4 of the Convention, the Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland would undertake the implementation of the right to free primary education to the maximum extent of available resources and expects to obtain the co-operation of the international Community for its full satisfaction as soon as possible."

SWEDEN

20 September 1991

With regard to the reservation made by Indonesia upon ratification concerning articles 1, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22 and 29:

"A reservation by which a State party limits its responsibilities under the Convention by invoking general principles of national law may cast doubts on the commitments of the reserving state to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. It is in the common interest of states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties also are respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties. The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the reservations.

"This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Sweden and the Republic of Indonesia."

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, from the Government of Sweden, objections of the same nature as the one above with regard to reservations made by the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

- 20 September 1991: with regard to the first reservation made by Pakistan upon ratification;
- 26 August 1992: with regard to the reservations made by Jordan upon ratification concerning articles 14, 20 and 21;
- 29 March 1994: with regard to the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon ratification;

- 1 September 1995: with regard to the reservation made by Iran (Islamic Republic of) upon ratification;
- 26 June 1996: with regard to the reservations made by Malaysia upon accession;
- 18 March 1997: with regard to the reservation made by Saudi Arabia upon accession;
- 9 February 1998: with regard to the reservation made by Oman upon accession.

SWITZERLAND[42]

Declaration:

Switzerland refers expressly to the obligations of all States to apply the rules of international humanitarian law and national law to the extent that they ensure better protection and care of children who are affected by an armed conflict.

......

(c) Reservation concerning article 10, paragraph 1:

Swiss legislation, which does not guarantee family reunification to certain categories of aliens, is unaffected.

(d) Reservation concerning article 37(c):

The separation of children deprived of liberty from adults is not unconditionally guarantied.

(e) Reservation concerning article 40:

The Swiss penal procedure applicable to children, which does not guarantee either the unconditional right to assistance or separation, where personnel or organization is concerned, between the examining authority and the sentencing authority, is unaffected.

....

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC[19,24,43]

Reservations:

The Syrian Arab Republic has reservations on the Convention's provisions which are not in conformity with the Syrian Arab legislations and with the Islamic Shariah's principles, in particular the content of article (14) related to the Right of the Child to the freedom of religion, and articles 20 and 21 concerning the adoption.

THAILAND[17]

Reservation:

"The application of articles 7, 22 .... of the Convention on the Rights of the Child shall be subject to the national laws, regulations and prevailing practices in Thailand."

TUNISIA[44]

Declarations:

...

...

3. The Government of the Republic of Tunisia declares that the Preamble to and the provisions of the Convention, in particular article 6, shall not be interpreted in such a way as to impede the application of Tunisian legislation concerning voluntary termination of pregnancy.

TURKEY

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Republic of Turkey reserves the right to interpret and apply the provisions of articles 17, 29 and 30 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child according to the letter and the spirit of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey and those of the Treaty of Lausanne of 24 July 1923.

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES[45]

Reservations:

Article 7:

The United Arab Emirates is of the view that the acquisition of nationality is an internal matter and one that is regulated and whose terms and conditions are established by national legislation.

Article 14:

The United Arab Emirates shall be bound by the tenor of this article to the extent that it does not conflict with the principles and provisions of Islamic law.

Article 17:

While the United Arab Emirates appreciates and respects the functions assigned to the mass media by the article, it shall be bound by its provisions in the light of the requirements of domestic statues and laws and, in accordance with the recognition accorded them in the preamble to the Convention, such a manner that the country's traditions and cultural values are not violated.

Article 21:

Since, given its commitment to the principles of Islamic law, the United Arab Emirates does not permit the system of adoption, it has reservations with respect to this article and does not deem it necesary to be bound by its provisions.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND[14,46]

Upon signature:

"The United Kingdom reserves the right to formulate, upon ratifying the Convention, any reservations or interpretative declarations which it might consider necessary."

Upon ratification:

Declarations:

"(a) The United Kingdom interprets the Convention as appli cable only following a live birth.

"(b) The United Kingdom interprets the references in the Convention to `parents' to mean only those persons who, as a matter of national law, are treated as parents. This includes cases where the law regards a child as having only one parent, for example where a child has been adopted by one person only and in certain cases where a child is conceived other than as a result of sexual intercourse by the woman who gives birth to it and she is treated as the only parent.

Reservations:

"[.....]"

Declaration:

"The United Kingdom reserves the right to extend the Convention at a later date to any territory for whose international relations the Government of the United Kingdom is responsible."

7 September 1994

Declarations:

"The United Kingdom refers to the reservation and declarations (a), (b) and (c) which accompanied its instrument of ratification and makes a similar reservation and declarations in respect to each of its dependent territories.

The United Kingdom, in respect of each of its dependent territories except Hong Kong and Pitcairn, reserves the right to apply article 32 subject to the laws of those territories which treat certain persons under 18 not as children but as `young people'. In respect of Hong Kong, the United Kingdom reserves the right not to apply article 32 (b) in so far as it might require regulation of the hours of employment ofyoung persons who have attained the age of fifteen years in respect of work in non-industrial establishments.

Where at any time there is a lack of suitable detention facilities or where the mixing of adults and children is deemed to be mutually beneficial, the United Kingdom, in respect of each of its dependent territories, reserves the right not to apply article 37 (c) in so far as those provisions require children who are detained to be accommodated separately from adults.

The United Kingdom, in respect of Hong Kong and the Cayman Islands, will seek to apply the Convention to the fullest extent to children seeking asylum in those territories except in so far as conditions and resources make full implementation impracticable. In particular, in relation to article 22, the United Kingdom reserves the right to continue to apply any legislation in those territories governing the detention of children seeking refugee status, the determination of their status and their entry into, stay in and departure from those territories.

The Government of the United Kingdom reserves the right to extend the Convention at a later date to any other territories for whose international relations the Government of the United Kingdom is responsible."

URUGUAY

Upon signature:

Declaration:

On signing this Convention, Uruguay reaffirms the right to make reservations upon ratification, if it considers it appropriate.

Upon ratification:

Reservation:

The Government of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay affirms, in regard to the provisions of article 38, paragraphs 2 and 3, that in accordance with Uruguayan law it would have been desirable for the lower age limit for taking a direct part in hostilities in the event of an armed conflict to be set at 18 years instead of 15 years as provided in the Convention.

Furthermore, the Government of Uruguay declares that, in the exercise of its sovereign will, it will not authorize any persons under its jurisdiction who have not attained the age of 18 years to take a direct part in hostilities and will not under any circumstances recruit persons who have not attained the age of 18 years.

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Interpretative declarations:

1. *Article 21 (b):*

The Government of Venezuela understands this provision as referring to international adoption and in no circumstances to placement in a foster home outside the country. It is also its view that the provision cannot be interpreted to the detriment of the State's obligation to ensure due protection of the child.

2. *Article 21 (d):*

The Government of Venezuela takes the position that neither the adoption nor the placement of children should in any circumstances result in financial gain for those in any way involved in it.

3. *Article 30:*

The Government of Venezuela takes the position that this article must be interpreted as a case in which article 2 of the Convention applies.

YUGOSLAVIA (FORMER)[3]

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, acceptance, accession or succession.)

AUSTRIA

18 June 1996

With regard to the reservations made by Malaysia upon accession:

"Under article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties which is reflected in article 51 of the [Convention] a reservation, in order to be admissible under international law, has to be compatible with the object and purpose of the treaty concerned. A reservation is incompatible with object and purpose of a treaty if it intends to derogate from provisions the implementation of which is essential to fulfilling its object and purpose.

The Government of Austria has examined the reservation made by Malaysia to the [Convention]. Given the general character of these reservations a final assessment as to its admissibility under international law cannot be made without further clarification.

Until the scope of the legal effects of this reservation is sufficiently specified by Malaysia, the Republic of Austria considers these reservations as not affecting any provision the implementation of which is essential to fulfilling the object and purpose of the [Convention].

Austria, however, objects to the admissibility of the reservations in question if the application of this reservation negatively affects the compliance of Malaysia ... with its obligations under the [Convention] essential for the fulfilment of its object and purpose.

Austria could not consider the reservation made by Malaysia ... as admissible under the regime of article 51 of the [Convention] and article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties unless Malaysia ... , by providing additional information or through subsequent practice to ensure [s] that the reservations are compatible with the provisions essential for the implementation of the object and purpose of the [Convention]".

3 March 1997

With regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam, Kiribati and Saudi Arabia upon accession:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made with regard to Malaysia.]

BELGIUM

26 September 1996

With regard to the reservations made by Singapore upon ratification:

The Government considers that paragraph 2 of the declarations, concerning articles 19 and 37 of the Convention and paragraph 3 of the reservations, concerning the constitutional limits upon the acceptance of the obligations contained in the Convention, are contrary to the purposes of the Convention and are consequently without effect under international law.

CZECH REPUBLIC[6]

DENMARK

10 February 1997

With regard to the reservation made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

"The Government of Denmark finds that the general reservation with reference to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islamic law is of unlimited scope and undefined character. Consequently, the Government of Denmark considers the said reservation as being incompatible with the object and purposes of the Convention and accordingly inadmissible and without effect under international law. Furthermore, it is a general principle of international law that national law may not be invoked as justification for failure to perform treaty obligations.

The Convention remains in force in its entirety between Brunei Darussalam and Denmark.

It is the opinion of the Government of Denmark, that no time limit applies to objections against reservations, which are inadmissible under international law.

The Government of Denmark recommends the Government of Brunei Darussalam to reconsider its reservation to the Convention on the Rights of the Child."

With regard to the reservation made by Saudi Arabia upon accession:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made with regard to Brunei Darussalam.]

FINLAND

25 July 1991

With regard to the reservation made by Indonesia upon ratification concerning articles 1, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22 and 29:

"In the view of the Government of Finland this reservation is subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform a treaty. For the above reason the Government of Finland objects to the said reservation. However, the Government of Finland does not consider that this objection constitutes an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between Finland and the Republic of Indonesia."

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, from the Government of Finland, objections of the same nature as the one above with regard to reservations made by the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

- 25 July 1991: with regard to the reservation made by Pakistan upon signature and confirmed upon ratification;
- 9 June 1993: with regard to the reservation made by Qatar upon signature;
- 24 June 1994: with regard to the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon ratification;
- 5 September 1995: with regard to the reservation made by Iran (Islamic Republic of) upon ratification.

14 June 1996

With regard to the reservations made by Malaysia upon accession:

"The reservation made by Malaysia covers several central provisions of the [said Convention]. The broad nature of the said reservation leaves open to what extent Malaysia commits itself to the Convention and to the fulfilment of its obligations under the Convention. In the view of the Government of Finland reservations of such comprehensive nature may contribute to undermining the basis of international human rights treaties.

The Government of Finland also recalls that the said reservation is subject to the general principle of the observance of the treaties according to which a party may not invoke its internal law, much less its national policies, as justification for its failure to perform its treaty obligations. It is in the common interest of the States that contracting parties to international treaties are prepared to undertake the necessary legislative changes in order to fulfil the object and purpose of the treaty. Moreover, the internal legislation as well as the national policies are also subject to changes which might further expand the unknown effects of the reservation.

In its present formulation the reservation is clearly incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and therefore inadmissible under article 51, paragraph 2, of the [said Convention]. Therefore the Government of Finland objects to such reservation. The Government of Finland further notes that the reservation made by the Government of Malaysia is devoid of legal effect.

The Government of Finland recommends the Government of Malaysia to reconsider its reservation to the [said Convention]."

With regard to the reservations made by Qatar upon ratification:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made with regard to Malaysia.]

26 November 1996

With regard to the reservations made by Singapore upon accession:

"The reservations made in paragraphs 2 and 3 by the Republic of Singapore, consisting of a general reference to national law without stating unequivocally the provisions the legal effect of which may be excluded or modified, do not clearly define to the other Parties of the Convention the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Convention and therefore create doubts about the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the said Convention. Reservations of such unspecified nature may contribute to undermining the basis of international human rights treaties.

The Government of Finland also recalls that these reservations of the Republic of Singapore are subject to the general principle of observance of treaties according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform its treaty obligations. It is in the common interest of States that Parties to international treaties are prepared to take the necessary legislative changes in order to fulfil the object and purpose of the treaty.

The Government of Finland considers that in their present formulation these reservations made by the Republic of Singapore are incompatible with the object and purpose of the said Convention and therefore, inadmissible under article 51, paragraph 2, of the said Convention. In view of the above, the Government of Finland objects to these reservations and notes that they are devoid of legal effect"

6 February 1998

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made with regard to Singapore.]

GERMANY[43]

25 June 1992

With regard to the reservations made by Myanmar upon accession:

The Federal Republic of Germany considers that the reservations made by the Union of Myanmar regarding articles 15 and 37 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 51, paragraph 2) and therefore objects to them.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between the Union of Myanmar and the Federal Republic of Germany.

17 March 1993

With regard to the reservations made by Tunisia upon ratification:

The Federal Republic of Germany considers the first of the declarations deposited by the Republic of Tunisia to be a reservation. It restricts the application of the first sentence of article 4 to the effect that any national legislative or statutory decisions adopted to implement the Convention may not conflict with the Tunisian Constitution. Owing to the very general wording of this passage the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is unable to perceive which provisions of the Convention are covered, or may be covered at some time in the future, by the reservation and in what manner. There is a similar lack of clarity with regard to the reservation relating to article 2.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to both these reservations. This objection does not prevent the Convention from entering into force as between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of Tunisia.

21 September 1994

With regard to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon ratification:

This reservation, owing to its indefinite nature, does not meet the requirements of international law. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convtion as between the Syrian Arab Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany.

11 August 1995

With regard to the reservation made by Iran (Islamic Republic) upon ratification:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made with regard to the Syrian Arab Republic.]

20 March 1996

With regard to the reservations made by Malaysia upon accession and Qatar upon ratification:

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers that such a reservation, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of [Malaysia and Qatar, respectively] under the Convention by invoking general principles of national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of [Malaysia and Qatar, respectively] to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contributes to undermining the basis of international treaty law. It is the common interest of states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties should be respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the said reservation.

This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and [Malaysia and Qatar, respectively].

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, from the Government of Germany, objections of the same nature as the one above with regard to reservations made by the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

- 13 June 1996: with regard to the reservation made by Botswana upon ratification;
- 4 September 1996: with regard to the reservations made by Singapore upon accession;
- 12 February 1997: with regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam and Saudi Arabia upon accession.
- 28 January 1998: with regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession.

IRELAND

With regard to the reservations made by Bangladesh, Djibouti, Indonesia, Jordan, Kuwait and Tunisia upon ratification, by Myanmar and Thailand upon accession, by Pakistan upon signature and confirmed upon ratification, and by Turkey upon signature:

"The Government of Ireland consider that such reservations, which seek to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention, by invoking general principles of national law, may create doubts as to the commitment of those States to the object and purpose of the Convention."

"This objection shall not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Ireland and the aforementioned States."

5 September 1995

With regard to the reservation made by Iran (Islamic Republic of) upon ratification:

"The reservation poses difficulties for the States Parties to the Convention in identifying the provisions of the Convention which the Islamic Government of Iran does not intend to apply and consequently makes it difficult for States Parties to the Convention to determine the extent of their treaty relations with the reserving State.

The Government of Ireland hereby formally makes objection to the reservation by the Islamic Republic of Iran."

26 June 1996

With regard to the reservation made by Malaysia upon accession:

"Ireland considers that this reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and is therefore prohibited by article 51 (2) of the Convention. The Government of Ireland also considers that it contributes to undermining the basis of international treaty law. The Government of Ireland therefore objects to the said reservation.

13 March 1997

With regard to the reservation made by Saudi Arabia upon accession:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made with regard to Malaysia.]

ITALY

18 July 1994

With regard to the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon ratification:

"... This reservation is too comprehensive and too general as to be compatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of Italy therefore objects to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between the Syrian Arab Republic and Italy."

14 June 1996

With regard to the reservations made by Qatar upon ratification:

"The Government of the Italian Republic considers that such a reservation, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of Qatar under the Convention by invoking general principles of national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of Qatar to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contributes to undermining the basis of international treaty law. It is common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become Parties should be respected, as to the objects and the purpose, by all Parties. The Government of the Italian Republic therefore objects to this reservation. This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the

Government of the Italian Republic and the State of Qatar."

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, from the Government of Italy, objections of the same nature as the one above with regard to reservations made by the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

- 14 June 1996: with regard to the reservation made by Botswana upon ratification;
- 4 October 1996: with regard to the reservation made by Singapore upon accession;
- 23 December 1996: with regard to the reservation made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession;
- 2 April 1998: with regard to the reservation to articles 14, 17 and 21 made by the United Arab Emirates upon accession.

NETHERLANDS

With regard to the reservations made by Djibouti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Pakistan and the Syrian Arab Republic upon ratification:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that such reservations, which seek to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention by invoking general principles of national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of these States to the object and purpose of the Convention and moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties should be respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties. the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to these reservations.

This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the aformentioned States."

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, from the Government of the Netherlands, objections of the same nature as the one above with regard to reservations made by the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

- 11 June 1996: with regard to the reservation made by Qatar upon ratification;
- 14 June 1996: with regard to the reservation made by Botswana upon accession and Turkey upon ratification;
- 25 June 1996: with regard to the reservation made by Malaysia upon accession;
- 6 November 1996: with regard to the reservations made by Singapore upon accession;
- 3 March 1997: with regard to the reservations made by Liechtenstein upon ratification and Brunei Darussalam, Kiribati and Saudi Arabia upon accession;
- 6 March 1997: with regard to the declaration made by Andorra upon ratification;
- 10 February 1998: with regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession.
- 6 April 1998: with regard to the reservation made to article 14 by the United Arab Emirates upon accession. *Moreover, the Government of the Netherlands made the following declaration with regard to the reservation made by the Government of the United Arab Emirates with respect to article 7* : “The Go vernment of the Kingdom of the Netherlans assumes that the United Arab Emirates shall ensure the implementation of the rights mentioned in article 7, first paragraph, of [the Convention] not only in accordance with its national law but also with its obligations under the relevant international instrument in this field.”

NORWAY

30 December 1991

With regard to the declaration made by Djibouti upon ratification:

"A reservation by which a State party limits its responsibilities under the Convention by invoking general principles of national law may create doubts about the commitments of the reserving state to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. It is in the common interest of states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties also are respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties. The Government of Norway, therefore, objects to this reservation.

"This objection shall not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Norway and the Republic of Djibouti."

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, from the Government of Norway, objections of the same nature as the one above with regard to reservations made by the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

- 30 December 1991: with regard to the reservation made by Indonesia upon ratification concerning articles 1, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22 and 29 and with regard to the reservation made by Pakistan upon signature and confirmed upon ratification;
- 25 October 1994: with regard to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon ratification;
- 5 September 1995: with regard to the reservation made by Iran (Islamic Republic of) upon ratification.

14 June 1996

With regard to the declaration made by Qatar upon ratification:

"The Government of Norway considers that the reservation made by the State of Qatar, due to its unlimited scope and undefined character, is inadmissible under international law. For that reason, the Government of Norway objects to the reservation made by the State of Qatar.

The Government of Norway does not consider this objection to preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Norway and the State of Qatar."

27 June 1996

With regard to the reservation made by Malaysia upon ratification:

"The Government of Noway considers that the reservation made by the Government of Malaysia, due to its very broad scope and undefined character, is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, and thus not permitted under article 51, paragraph 2, of the Convention. Moreover, the Government of Norway considers that the monitoring system established under the Convention is not optional and that, accordingly, reservations with respect to articles 44 and 45 of the Convention are not permissible. For these reasons, the Government of Norway objects to the reservation made by the Government of Malaysia.

The Government of Norway does not consider this objection to preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Norway and Malaysia."

29 November 1996

With regard to the reservation and declaration made by Singapore upon accession:

"The Government of Norway considers that reservation (3) made by the Republic of Singapore, due to its unlimited scope and undefined character, is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, and thus impermissible under article 51, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

Furthermore, the Government of Norway considers that declaration (2) made by the Republic of Singapore, in so far as it purports to exclude or to modify the legal effect of articles 19 and 37 of the Convention, also constitutes a reservation impermissible under the Convention, due to the fundamental nature of the rights concerned and the unspecified reference to domestic law.

For these reasons, the Government of Norway objects to the said reservations made by the Government of Singapore.

The Government of Norway does not consider this objection to preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Norway and the Republic of Singapore."

4 March 1997

With regard to the reservation made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made with regard to Qatar.]

13 March 1997

With regard to the reservation made by Saudi Arabia upon accession:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made with regard to Malaysia.]

9 February 1998

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made with regard to Singapore.]

PORTUGAL

15 July 1992

With regard to the reservations made by Myanmar upon accession, by Bangladesh, Djibouti, Indonesia, Kuwait and Pakistan upon ratification and by Turkey upon signature:

"The Government of Portugal considers that reservations by which a State limits its responsibilities under the Convention by invoking general principles of National Law may create doubts on the commitments of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of International Law. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties also are respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties. The Government of Portugal therefore objects to the reservations.

This objection shall not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Portugal and Myanmar.

The Government of Portugal furthermore notes that, as a matter of principle, the same objection could be made to the reservations presented by Bangladesh, Djibouti, Indonesia, Kuwait, Pakistan and Turkey."

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, from the Government of the Portugal, objections of the same nature as the one above with regard to reservations made by the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

- 13 December 1994: with regard to the reservation made by Islamic Republic of Iran upon ratification;
- 4 December 1995: with regard to the reservation made by Malaysia upon accession;
- 11 January 1996: with regard to the reservation made by Qatar upon ratification;
- 30 January 1997: with regard to reservations made by Brunei Darussalam, Kiribati and Saudi Arabia upon accession.

SLOVAKIA[6]

9 August 1993

With regard to the reservation made by Qatar upon signature:

"The Slovak Republic regards the general reservation made by the State of Qatar upon signature of the Convention as incompatible with the object and purpose of the said Convention as well as in contradiction with the well established principle of the Law of Treaties according to which a State cannot invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform a treaty. Therefore, the Slovak Republic objects to the said general reservation."

SWEDEN

20 September 1991

With regard to the reservation made by Indonesia upon ratification concerning articles 1, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22 and 29:

"A reservation by which a State party limits its responsibilities under the Convention by invoking general principles of national law may cast doubts on the commitments of the reserving state to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. It is in the common interest of states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties also are respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties. The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the reservations.

"This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Sweden and the Republic of Indonesia."

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, from the Government of Sweden, objections of the same nature as the one above with regard to reservations made by the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

- 20 September 1991: with regard to the first reservation made by Pakistan upon ratification;
- 26 August 1992: with regard to the reservations made by Jordan upon ratification concerning articles 14, 20 and 21;
- 29 March 1994: with regard to the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon ratification;
- 1 September 1995: with regard to the reservation made by Iran (Islamic Republic of) upon ratification;
- 26 June 1996: with regard to the reservations made by Malaysia upon accession;
- 18 March 1997: with regard to the reservation made by Saudi Arabia upon accession;
- 9 February 1998: with regard to the reservation made by Oman upon accession.

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
China	10 Apr 2003	Hong Kong Special Administrative Region
Netherlands	17 Dec 1997	Netherlands (Netherlands Antilles)
	18 Dec 2000	Aruba
Portugal	27 Apr 1999	Macau
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	7 Sep 1994	Anguilla, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands (Malvinas), Hong Kong, Isle of Man, Montserrat, Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands, St. Helena and Dependencies, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands and Turks and Caicos Islands

---

Notes:

[1] In the four months following the communication of the proposal of amendment, less than one third of the States Parties indicated that they favoured a conference of States Parties for the purpose of considering and voting upon the proposals in accordance with article 50 (1) of the Convention. Consequently the conference referred to in article 50 (1) of the Convention was not convened.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 49 (A/44/49)* , p. 166.

[3] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 26 January 1990 and 3 January 1991, respectively, with the following reservation:

Reservation:

"The competent authorities (ward authorities) of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia may, under article 9, paragraph 1 of the Convention, make decisions to deprive parents of their right to raise their children and give them an upbringing without prior judicial determination in accordance with the internal legislation of the SFR of Yugoslavia."

See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] On 27 April 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General that the Convention would apply to Macao.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Macao from China and Portugal (see note 3 under “China” and note 1 under “Portugal” regarding Macao in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Maco, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with the reservation made by China will also apply to the Maco Special Administrative Region.

[5] On 10 June 1997, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from the Governments of China and the United Kingdom (see also note 2 under “China” and note 2 under “United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland” regarding Hong Kong in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with the reservation made by China will also apply to the Hong Kong special Administrative Region.

In addition, the notification made by the Government of China contained the following declaration:

1. The Government of the People's Republic of China, on behalf of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, interprets the Convention as applicable only following a live birth.

2. The Government of the People's Republic of China reserves, for the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, the right to apply such legislation, in so far as it relates to the entry into, stay in and departure from the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of those who do not have the right under the laws of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region to enter and remain in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, and to the acquisition and possession of residentship as it may deem necessary from time to time.

3. The Government of the People's Republic of China interprets, on behalf of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, the references in the Convention to "parents" to mean only those persons who, under the laws of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, are treated as parents. This includes cases where the laws regard a child as having only one parent, for example where a child has been adopted by one person only and in certain cases where a child is conceived other than as a result of sexual intercourse by the woman who gives birth to it and she is treated as the only parent.

4. The Governople's Republic of China reserves, for the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, the right not to apply article 32 (2) (b) of the Convention in so far as it might require regulation of the hours of employment of young persons who have attained the age of fifteen years in respect of work in non-industrial establishments.

5. ...

6. Where at any time there is a lack of suitable detention facilities, or where the mixing of adults and children is deemed

to be mutually beneficial, the Government of the People's Republic of China reserves, for the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, the right not to apply article 37 (c) of the Convention in so far as those provisions require children who are detained to be accommodated separately from adults.

In regard to the above-mentioned declaration, by a notification recieved on 10 April 2003, the Government of the People's Republic of China informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its declaration relating to article 22 of the Convention. The declaration reads as follows:

The Government of the People's Republic of China, on behalf of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, seeks to apply the Convention to the fullest extent to children seeking asylum in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region except in so far as conditions and resources make full implementation impracticable. In particular, in relation to article 22 of the Convention the Government of the People's Republic of China reserves the right to continue to apply legislation in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region governing the detention of children seeking refugee status, the determination of their status and their entry into, stay in and departure from the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

[6] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 30 September 1990 and 7 January 1991, respectively, with the following declaration in respect of article 7 (1):

"In cases of irrevocable adoptions, which are based on the principle of anonymity of such adoptions, and of artificial fertilization, where the physician charged with the operation is required to ensure that the husband and wife on one hand and the donor on the other hand remain unknown to each other, the non-communication of a natural parent's name or natural parents' names to the child is not in contradiction with this provision."

By a communication received on 7 June 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia had made the following objections with regard to the reservation made by Kuwait upon signature:

"These reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. In the opinion of the Czechoslovak Government the said reservations are in contradiction to the generally recognized principle of international law according to which a state cannot invoke the provisions of its own internal law as justification for its failure to perform a treaty. Therefore the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic does not recognize these reservations as valid."

See also note 1 under “Czech Republic” and note 1 under “Slovakia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] On 11 May 1993, the Government of Denmark notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its declaration with regard to the application of the Convention to Greenland and the Faroe Islands which reads as follows:

"Until further notice the Convention shall not apply to Greenland and the Faroe Islands."

[8] On 31 July 2003, the Government of Egypt informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification in respect of articles 20 and 21 of the Convention. The reservation read as follows:

Since The Islamic Shariah is one of the fundamental sources of legislation in Egyptian positive law and because the Shariah, in enjoining the provision of every means of protection and care for children by numerous ways and means, does not include among those ways and means the system of adoption existing in certain other bodies of positive law,

The Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt expresses its reservation with respect to all the clauses and provisions relating to adoption in the said Convention, and in particular with respect to the provisions governing adoption in articles 20 and 21 of the Convention.

[9] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 7 March 1990 and 2 October 1990, respectively. See also note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[11] For the Kingdom in Europe.

Subsequently, on 17 December 1997, the Government of the Netherlands informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to accept the Convention on behalf of the Netherlands Antilles subject to the following reservations and declarations:

Reservations:

" *Article 26:*

The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the provisions of article 26 of the Convention with the reservation that these provisions shall not imply an independent entitlement of children to social security, including insurance.

Article 37:

The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the provisions of article 37(c) of the Convention with the reservation that these provisions shall not prevent :

- the application of adult penal law to children of sixteen years and older, provided that certain criteria laid down by law have been met;

- that a child which has been detained will not always be accommodated separately from adults; if the number of children that has to be detained at a certain time is unexpectedly large, (temporary) accommodations together with adults may be unavoidable.

Article 40:

The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the provisions of article 40 of the Convention with the reservation that cases involving minor offences may be tried without the presence of legal assistance and that with respect to such offences the position remains that no provision is made in all cases for a review of the facts or of any measures imposed as a consequence.

Declarations:

Article 14 :

It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that article 14 of the Convention is in accordance with the provisions of article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 19 December 1966 and that this article shall include the freedom of a child to have or adopt a religion or belief of his or her choice as soon as the child is capable of making such choice in view of his or her age or maturity.

Article 22 :

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands declares that whereas the Netherlands Antilles are not bound by the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, article 22 of the present Convention shall be interpreted as containing a reference only to such other international human rights or humanitarian instruments as are binding on the Kingdom of the Netherlands with respect to the Netherlands Antilles.

Article 38 :

With regard to article 38 of the Convention, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands declares that it is of the opinion that States should not be allowed to involve children directly or indirectly in hostilities and that the minimum age for the recruitment or incorporation of children in the armed forces should be above fifteen years.

In times of armed conflict, provisions shall prevail that are most conducive to guaranteeing the protection of children under international law, as referred to in article 41 of the Convention."

Further, on 18 December 2000, the Government of the Netherlands informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to accept the Convention on behalf of Aruba subject to the following rservations and declarations:

Reservations :

"Article 26

The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the provisions of article 26 of the Convention with the reservation that these provisions shall not imply an independent entitlement of children to social security, including social insurance.

Article 37

The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the provisions of article 37 (c) of the Convention with the reservation that these provisions shall not prevent:

- the application of adult penal law to children of sixteen years and older, provided that certain criteria laid down by law have been met;

- that a child which has been detained will not always be accommodated separately from adults; if the number of children that has to be detained at a certain time is unexpectedly large, (temporary) accommodation together with adults m be unavoidable.

Article 40

The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the provisions of article 40 of the Convention with the reservation that cases involving minor offences may be tried without the presence of legal assistance and that with respect to such offences the position remains that no provision is made in all cases for a review of the facts or of any measures imposed as a consequence."

Declarations:

"Article 14

It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that Article 14 of the Convention is in accordance with the provisions of Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 19 December 1966 and that this Article shall include the freedom of a child to have or adopt a religion or belief of his or her choice as soon as the child is capable of making such choice in view of his or her age or maturity.

Article 22

Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands declares that whereas Aruba is not bound by the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, Article 22 of the present Convention shall be interpreted as containing a reference only to such other international human rights or humanitarian instruments as are binding on the Kingdom of the Netherlands with respect to Aruba.

Article 38

With regard to Article 38 of the Convention, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands declares that it is of the opinion that States should not be allowed to involve children directly or indirectly in hostilities and that the minimum age for the recruitment or incorporation of children in the armed forces should be above fifteen years. In times of armed conflict, provisions shall prevail that are most conducive to guaranteeing the protection of children under international law, as referred to in Article 41 of the Convention."

[12] The instrument of ratification also specifies that "such ratification shall extend to Tokelau only upon notification to the Secretary-General of the United Nations of such extension".

[13] On 12 April 1994, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Greece the following communication:

"Succession of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 20 November 1989, does not imply its recognition on behalf of the Hellenic Republic."

[14] In a communication received on 7 September 1994, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland indicated that the Convention will apply to the Isle of Man, Anguilla, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands (Malvinas), Hong Kong, Montserrat,

Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands, St. Helena, St. Helena Dependencies, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands.

In this regard, the Secretary-General received, on 3 April 1995, from the Government of Argentina the following objection:

The Government of Argentina rejects the extension of the application of the [said Convention] to the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, effected by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on 7 September 1994, and reaffirms its sovereignty over those islands, which are an integral part of its national territory.

Subsequently, on 17 January 1996, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following communication:

"... The Government of the United Kingdom has no doubt about the sovereignty of the United Kingdom over the Falkland Islands and over South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and its consequential right to extend the said Convention to these Territories. The United Kingdom Government rejects as unfounded the claims by the Government of Argentina and is unable to regard the Argentine objection as having any legal effect."

Subsequently, on 5 October 2000, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following communication:

[The Argentine Republic] wishes to refer to the report submitted by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the Committee on the Rights of the Child, which contains an addendum entitled "Overseas Dependent Territories and Crown Dependencies of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland"(CRC/C/41/Add.9).

In that connection, the Argentine Republic wishes to recall that by its note of 3 April 1995 it rejected the extension of the application of the Convention on the Rights of the Child to the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands effected by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on 7 September 1994.

The Government of Argentina rejects the designation of the Malvinas Islands as Overseas Dependent Territories of the United Kingdom or any other similar designation.

Consequently, the Argentine Republic does not recognize the section concerning the Malvinas Islands contained in the report which the United Kingdom has submitted to the Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC/C/41/Add.9) or any other document or instrument having a similar tenor that may derive from this alleged territorial extension.

The United Nations General Assembly has adopted resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25, in which it recognizes that a dispute exists concerning sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands and urges the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to continue negotiations with a view to resolving the dispute peacefully and definitively as soon as possible, assisted by the good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who is to report to the General Assembly on the progress made.

The Argentine Republic reaffirms its rights of sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime spaces, which are an integral part of its national territory.

Further, on 20 December 2000, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the following communcation:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland rejects as unfounded the claims made by the Argentine Republic in its communicat to the depositaof 5 October 2000. The Government of the United Kingdom recalls that in its declaration received by the depositary on 16 January 1996 it rejected the objection by the Argentine Republic to the extension by the United Kingdom of the Convention on the Rights of the Child to the Falkland Islands and to South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands. The Government of the United Kingdom has no doubt about the sovereignty of the United Kingdom over the Falkland Islands and over South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and its consequential rights to apply the Convention with respect to those Territories."

[15] The signature was affixed on behalf of the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[16] Upon ratification, the Government of Andorra made the following declarations:

A. The Principality of Andorra deplores the fact that the [said Convention] does not prohibit the use of children in armed conflicts. It also disagrees with the provisions of article 38, paragraphs 2 and 3, concerning the participation and recruitment of children from the age of 15.

B. The Principality of Andorra will apply the provisions of articles 7 and 8 of the Convention without prejudice to the provisions of part II, article 7 of the Constitution of the Principality of Andorra, concerning Andorran nationality.

Article 7 of the Constitution of Andorra provides that:

A *Llei qualificada* shall determine the rules pertaining to the acquisition and loss of nationality and the legal consequences thereof.

Acquisition or retention of a nationality other than Andorran nationality shall result in the loss of the latter in accordance with the conditions and limits established by law.

By a communication received on 1 March 2006, the Government of Andorra notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the following declaration made upon ratification:

B. The Principality of Andorra will apply the provisions of articles 7 and 8 of the Convention without prejudice to the provisions of part II, article 7 of the Constitution of the Principality of Andorra, concerning Andorran nationality.

Article 7 of the Constitution of Andorra provides that:

A *Llei qualificada* shall determine the rules pertaining to the acquisition and loss of nationality and the legal consequences thereof.

Acquisition or retention of a nationality other than Andorran nationality shall result in the loss of the latter in accordance with the conditions and limits established by law.

[17] The Secretary-General received from the Government of Sweden the following communications: on 20 July 1993, with regard to the reservations made upon accession by Thailand concerning articles 7, 22 and 29, upon ratification by Myanmar concerning articles 15 and 37, upon ratification by Bangladesh concerning article 21, upon ratification by Djibouti concerning the whole Convention, and on 29 March 1994, with regard to the reservation made upon signature by Qatar.

Subsequently, on 11 April 1997, the Government of Thailand notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with regard to article 29.

[18] On 16 September 2008, the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made in respect of article 9 (1) of the Convention. The reservation read as follows:

"The Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina reserves the right not to apply paragraph 1 of article 9 of the Convention since the internal legislation of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina provides for the right of competent authorities (guardianship authorities) to determine on separation of a child from his/her parents without a previous judicial review."

[19] In this regard, on 16 November 1995, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Denmark, the following communication:

"Because of their unlimited scope and undefined character these reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and accordingly inadmissible and without effect under international law. Therefore, the Government of Denmark objects to these reservations. The Convention remains in force in its entirety between Djibouti, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Pakistan, the Syrian Arab Republic respectively and Denmark.

It is the opinion of the Government of Denmark that no time limit applies to objections against reservations, which are inadmissible under international law.

The Government of Denmark recommends the Governments of Djibouti, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Pakistan and the Syrian Arab Republic to reconsider their reservations to the Convention on the Rights of the Child."

On 3 July 1996, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Denmark a communication regarding the reservations made by Botswana and Qatar, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis* , as the one made on 16 November 1995.

[20] On 13 March 1997, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Ireland the following communication with regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made with regard to Saudi Arabia under "Objections".]

[21] On 20 March 1997, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Finland communciations with regard to reservations made by Brunei Darussalam and Saudi Arabia upon accession:

[Same text, mutatis mutandis, as the objection made with regard to Singapore under "Objections".]

[22] On 13 August 1997, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Sweden the following communications with regard to reservations made by Brunei Darussalam, Kiribati and Singapore upon accession to the Convention:

[Same text, mutatis mutandis, as the one made with regard to Indonesia under "Objections" .

[23] On 26 May 1998, the Government of Croatia informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation made upon succession in respect to article 9, paragraph 1 of the Convention. The reservation read as follows:

The Republic of Croatia reserves the right not to apply paragraph 1 of article 9 of the Convention since the internal legislation of the Republic of Croatia provides for the right of competent authorities (Centres for Social Work) to determine on separation of a child from his/her parents without a previous judicial review."

[24] On 6 February 1995, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the Netherlands the following communication with regard to the reservations made upon upon ratification by Djibouti, Indonesia, Pakistan and the Syrian Arab Republic:

[Same text, mutatis mutandis, as the objection made with regard to Iran (Islamic Republic of) under "Objections".]

Subsequently, on 23 July 1997, the Government of Pakistan informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification which reads as follows:

"Provisions of the Convention shall be interpreted in the light of the principles of Islamic laws and values."

Subsequently, on 2 February 2005, the Government of Indonesia informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation made upon ratification. The reservation reads as follows:

The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia guarantees the fundamental rights of the child irrespective of their sex, ethnicity or race. The Constitution prescribes those rights to be implemented by national laws and regulations.

The ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child by the Republic of Indonesia does not imply the acceptance of obligations going beyond the Constitutional limits nor the acceptance of any obligation to introduce any right beyond those prescribed under the Constitution.

With reference to the provisions of articles 1, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22 and 29 of this Convention, the Government of the Republic of Indonesia declares that it will apply these articles in conformity with its Constitution.

[25] Statements delivered by [the Government of Ecuador] on agenda item 108, in the Third Committee on 14 November 1989, particularly as concerns the interpretation to be given to article 24, in the light of the preamble of the Convention, and article 38 (ref: A/C.3/44/SR.41).

[26] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 15 February 1990, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany indicated that "it was [its] intention to make the [said] declaration on the occasion of the signing of the Convention on the Rights of the Child".

[27] In this regard, the Secretary-General received communications from the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Austria (6 September 1995):

Under article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties which is reflected in article 51 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child - a reservation, in order to be admissible under international law, has to be compatible with the object and purpose of the treaty concerned. A reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty if it intends to derogate provisions the implementation of which is essential to fulfilling its object and purpose.

The Government of Austria has examined the reservation made by the Islamic Republic of Iran to the [said Convention]. Given the general character of this reservation a final assessment as to its admissibility under international law cannot be made without further clarification.

Until the scope of the legal effects of this reservation is sufficiently specified by the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Republic of Austria considers this reservation as not affecting any provision the implementation of which is essential to fulfilling the object and purpose of the [said Convention].

Austria, however, objects to the admissibility of the reservation in question if the application of this reservation negatively affects the compliance by the Islamic Republic of Iran with its obligations under the [said Convention] essential for the fulfilment of its object and purpose.

Austria could not consider the reservation made by the Islamic Republic of Iran as admissible under the regime of article 51 of the [said Convention] and article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties unless Iran, by providing additional information or through subsequent practice, ensures that the reservation is compatible with the provisions essential for the implementation of the object and purpose of the [said Convention]."

Italy (25 September 1995):

"This reservation, owing to its unlimited scope and undefined character, is inadmissible under international law. The Government of the Italian Republic, therefore, objects to the reservation made by the Islamic Republic of Iran. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Italian Republic."

[28] On 9 June 1993, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Finland, the following communication:

"The Government of Finland has examined the contents of the reservation made by Jordan [...].

In the view of the Government of Finland this reservation is subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke general principles of national law as justification for failure to perform its treaty obligations. For the above reason the Government of Finland objects to the said reservations. However, the Government of Finland does not consider that this objection constitutes an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between Finland and Jordan."

[29] On 10 December 2003, the Government of Liechtenstein informed the Secretary-General of the following:

"The Principality of Liechtenstein partially withdraws its reservation concerning article 10 of the Convention as contained in the annex of the instrument of accession of 18 December 1995, namely with regard to paragraph 2 of the article guaranteeing the right of the child to maintain personal relations and direct contacts with both parents."

[30] Subsequently, the Government of Malaysia informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation to articles 22, 28 paragraph 1 (b), (c), (d), (e) and paragraphs 2 and 3, article 40 paragraph 3 and 4, articles 44 and 45" made upon accession. It should be noted that, the Secretary-General had received from the following States, communications in regard to the reservations made by the Government of Malaysia upon accession, on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Belgium (1 July 1996):

The Belgian Government believes that this reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and that, consequently, in accordance with article 51, paragraph 2, of the Convention, it is not permitted.

...

Accordingly, Belgium wishes to be bound by the Convention in its entirety as regards [the State of Malaysia] which [has] expressed reservations prohibited by the [said] Convention.

Moreover, as the 12 month period specified in article 20.5 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties is not applicable to reservations which are null and void, Belgium's objection to such reservations is not subject to any particular time-limit.

Denmark (2 July 1996):

"The reservation is covering multiple provisions, including central provisions of the Convention. Furthermore, it is a general principle of international law that internal law may not be invoked as justification for failure to perform treaty obligations. Consequently, the Government of Denmark considers the said reservation as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and accordingly inadmissible and without effect under international law. The Convention remains in force in its entirety between Malaysia and Denmark.

It is the opinion of the Government of Denmark that no time limit applies to objections against reservations, which are inadmissible under international law.

The Government of Denmark recommends the Government of Malaysia to reconsider its reservaion to the said Convention."

[31] On 20 August 2001, the Government of Malta informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation made upon ratification. The reservation reads as follows:

"Article 26 - The Government of Malta is bound by the obligations arising out of this article to the extent of present social security legislation."

[32] On 4 June 2008, the Government of the Republic of Mauritius informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession in respect to article 22 of the Convention. The text of the reservation reads as follows:

"[Mauritius] having considered the Convention, hereby accedes to it with express reservation with regard to Article 22 of the said Convention."

[33] On 19 October 2006, the Government of Morocco informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made with regard to article 14 made upon ratificaton. The reservation reads as follows:

The Kingdom of Morocco, whose Constitution guarantees to all the freedom to pursue his religious affairs, makes a reservation to the provisions of article 14, which accords children freedom of religion, in view of the fact that Islam is the State religion.

[34] On 19 October 1993, the Government of Myanmar notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw the following reservations made upon accession with regard to articles 15 and 37:

"Article 15

"1. The Union of Myanmar interprets the expression `the law' in article 15, paragraph 2, to mean the Laws, as well as the Decrees and Executive Orders having the force of law, which are for the time being in force in the Union of Myanmar.

"2. The Union of Myanmar understands that such restrictions on freedom of association and freedom of peaceful assembly imposed in conformity with the said Laws, Decrees and Executive Orders as are required by the exigencies of the situation obtaining in the Union of Myanmar are permissible under article 15, paragraph 2.

"3. The Union of Myanmar interprets the expression `national security' in the same paragraph as encompassing the supreme national interest, namely, the non-disintegration of the Union, the non-disintegration of national solidarity and the perpetuation of national sovereignty, which constitute the paramount national causes of the Union of Myanmar."

"Article 37

The Union of Myanmar accepts in principle the provisions of article 37 as they are in consonance with its laws, rules, regulations, procedures and practice as well as with its traditional, cultural and religious values. However, having regard to the exigencies of the situation obtaining in the country at present, the Union of Myanmar states as follows:

"1. Nothing contained in Article 37 shall prevent, or be construed as preventing, the Government of the Union of Myanmar from assuming or exercising, in conformity with the laws for the time being in force in the country and the procedures established thereunder, such powers as are required by the exigencies of the situation for the preservation and strengthening of the rule of law, the maintenance of public order (*ordre public)* and, in particular, the protection of the supreme natiolterest, namely, the non-disintegration of the Union, the non-disintegration of national solidarity and the perpetuation of national sovereignty, which constitute the paramount national causes of the Union of Myanmar.

"2. Such powers shall include the powers of arrest, detention, imprisonment, exclusion, interrogation, enquiry and investigation."

[35] On 19 September 1995, the Government of Norway notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with respect to article 40(2)(b)(v) made upon ratification of the Convention.

[36] On 18 June 1996, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Austria, the following communication with regard to the reservation made by Qatar upon ratification:

[Same text, mutatis mutandis, as the objection made with regard to Malaysia under "Objections".]

[37] On 1 July 1996, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Belgium, the following communication:

...

The Belgian Government believes that this reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and that, consequently, in accordance with article 51, paragraph 2, of the Convention, it is not permitted.

Accordingly, Belgium wishes to be bound by the Convention in its entirety as regards the [State of Qatar] which [has] expressed reservations prohibited by the [said] Convention.

Moreover, as the 12 month period specified in article 20.5 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties is not applicable to reservations which are null and void, Belgium's objection to such reservations is not subject to any particular time-limit.

[38] On 16 October 2008, the Government of the Republic of Korea informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation in respect of article 9, paragraph 3 made upon ratification.

[39] On 28 January 1997, the Government of Yugoslavia informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made by the former Yugoslavia upon ratification of the Convention the text of which reads as follows:

Reservation:

"The competent authorities (ward authorities) of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia may, under article 9, paragraph 1 of the Convention, make decisions to deprive parents of their right to raise their children and give them an upbringing without prior judicial determination in accordance with the internal legislation of the SFR of Yugoslavia."

In this regard, the Secretary-General received on 28 May 1997, from the Government of Slovenia, the following communication:

"[The Government of Slovenia] would like to express its disagreement with the content of the [notification by the depositary concerning the withdrawal of the reservation]. The State which in 1991 notified its ratification of the [said Convention] and made the reservation was the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY) but the State which on 28 January 1997 notified the withdrawal of its reservation was the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY). In that connection the [Government of Slovenia] would like to draw attention to the resolutions of the Security Council (757, 777) and the General Assembly (47/1), all from 1992, which stated that `the state formerly known as the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has ceased to exist"and to the opinion of the Arbitration Commission of the UN/EC Conference on the former Yugoslavia that "the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) is a new State which cannot be considered the sole successor to the SFRY.'

The [said] notification is therefore incorrect and misleading since it is erroneously suggesting that the State which would like to withdraw the reservation is the same person under international law as the State which made the reservation. It is believed that the Secretary-General should be precise in making references to States Parties to international agreements in respect of which he performs depositary functions. Therefore it is the opinion of the Government of the Republic of Slovenia that the withdrawal of the reservation made by the Government of the FRY cannot be considered valid, since it was made by a State that did not make the reservation. The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia should, as one of the successor States of the former SFRY, notify its succession if it wishes to be considered a Party to the Convention."

Further, on 3 and 4 June and 10 October 1997, respectively, the Secretary-General received from the Governments of Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, communications, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis* , as the one made by Slovenia.

On 12 March 2001, the Government of Yugoslavia notified the Secretary-General of its intent to succeed to the Convention and confirmed that it does not maintain the reservation made by the former Yugoslavia upon ratification. See also notes 1 under “Bosnia and Herzegovina”, “Croatia”, “former Yugoslavia”, “Slovenia”, “The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” and “Yugoslavia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[40] On 3 December 1996, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Portugal the following communication regarding the reservation made by Singapore:

[Same text, mutatis mutandis, as the one made with regard to Myanmar under "Objections".]

[41] On 19 January 2004, the Government of Slovenia informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation made upon succession. The reservation reads as follows:

"The Republic of Slovenia reserves the right not to apply paragraph 1 of article 9 of the Convention since the internal legislation of the Republic of Slovenia provides for the right of competent authorities (centres for social work) to determine on separ ation of a child from his/her parents without a previous judicial review."

[42] In a communication received on 12 January 2004, the Government of Switzerland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation in respect of article 40, paragraph 2, subparagraph b (vi) made upon ratification which reads as follows:

The guarantee of having the free assistance of an interpreter does not exempt the beneficiary from the payment of any resulting costs.

Subsequently, on 8 April 2004, the Government of Switzerland informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation in respect of article 5 made upon ratification, which reads as follows:

The Swiss legislation concerning parental authority is unaffected.

Further, on 1 May 2007, the Government of Switzerland informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservations in respect of article 7 (2) and article 40 (2) made upon ratification, which reads as follows:

Article 7 (2):

The Swiss legislation on nationality, which does not grant the right to acquire Swiss nationality, is unaffected.

Article 40 (2):

The federal legislation concerning the organization of criminal justice, which establishes an exception to the right to a conviction and sentence being reviewed by a higher tribunal where the person concerned was tried by the highest tribunal at first instance, is unaffected.

[43] On 6 May 1996, the Secretary-General received the following communication from the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic with regard to the objection by the Government of Germany to its reservations made upon ratification:

The laws in effect in the Syrian Arab Republic do not recognize the system of adoption, although they do require that protection and assistance should be provided to those for whatever reason permanently or temporarily deprived of their family environment and that alternative care should be assured them through foster placement and *kafalah* , in care centres and special institutions and, without assimilation to their blood lineage *(nasab)* , by foster families, in accordance with the legislation in force based on the principles of the Islamic *Shariah* .

The reservations of the Syrian Arab Republic to articles 20 and 21 mean that approval of the Convention should not in any way be interpreted as recognizing or permitting the system of adoption to which reference is made in these two articles and are subject to these limitations only.

The reservations of the Syrian Arab Republic to article 14 of the Convention are restricted only to its provisions relating to religion and do not concern those relating to thought or conscience. They concern: the extent to which the right in question might conflict with the right of parents and guardians to ensure the religious education of their children, as recognized by the United Nations and set forth in article 18, paragraph 4, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; the extent to which it might conflict with the right, established by the laws in force, of a child to choose a religion at an appointed time or in accordance with designated procedures or at a particular age in the case where he clearly has the mental and legal capacity to do so; and the extent to which it might conflict with public order and principles of the Islamic Shariah on this matter that are in effet in the Syrian Arab Republic with respect to each case.

[44] On 1 March 2002, the Government of Tunisia informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the following declaration and reservation made upon ratification:

Declaration:

2.The Government of the Republic of Tunisia declares that its undertaking to implement the provisions of this Convention shall be limited by the means at its disposal.

Reservation:

2. The Government of the Republic of Tunisia regards the provisions of article 40, paragraph 2 (b) (v), as representing a general principle to which exceptions may be made under national legislation, as is the case for some offences on which final judgement is rendered by cantonal or criminal courts without prejudice to the right of appeal in their regard to the Court of Cassation entrusted with ensuring the implementation of the law.

On 23 September 2008, the Secretary-General received a notification from the Government of Tunisia that it had decided to withdraw the following declaration and reservations made upon ratification:

Declaration:

1. The Government of the Republic of Tunisia declares that it shall not, in implementation of this Convention, adopt any legislative or statutory decision that conflicts with the Tunisian Constitution.

Reservations:

1. The Government of the Republic of Tunisia enters a reservation with regard to the provisions of article 2 of the convention, which may not impede implementation of the provisions of its national legislation concerning personal status, particularly in relation to marriage and inheritance rights.

3. The Government of the Republic of Tunisia considers that article 7 of the Convention cannot be interpreted as prohibiting implementation of the provisions of national legislation relating to nationality and, in particular,to cases in which it is forfeited.

[45] On 16 November 1998, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Austria a communication with regard to reservations made by the United Arab Emirates upon accession:

*[Same text, identical in essence, as the objection made with regard to Malaysia under " **Objections** ".]*

[46] On 18 April 1997, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the following reservation made upon ratification:

" (f) In Scotland there are tribunals (known as `children's hearing') which consider the welfare of the child and deal with the majority of offences which a child is alleged to have committed. In some cases, mainly of welfare nature, the child is temporarily deprived of its liberty for up to seven days prior to attending the hearing. The child and its family are, however, allowed access to a lawyer during this period. Although the decisions of the hearings are subject to appeal to the courts, legal representation is not permitted at the proceedings of the children's hearings themselves. Children's hearings have proved over the years to be a very effective way of dealing with the problems of children in a less formal, non-adversarial manner. Accordingly, the United Kingdom, in respect of article 37 (d), reserves its right to continue the present operation of children's hearings."

Further, on 3 August 1999, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland informed the Secretary-General of the following:

[...] the following reservation entered upon ratification in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is hereby withdrawn:

[(d)] Employment legislation in the United Kingdom does not treat persons under 18, but over the school-leaving age as children, but as `young people'. Accordingly the United Kingdom reserves the right to continue to apply article 32 subject to such employment legislation.

The United Kingdom's reservations to article 32 in respect of its overseas territories, formerly referred to as `dependent territories', set out in the Declarations dated 7 September 1994, are unaffected."

On 18 November 2008, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the following reservations made upon ratification:

“.....the Government of the United Kingdom withdraws the following reservations, made at the time of ratification of the Convention:

(c) The United Kingdom reserves the right to apply such legislation, in so far as it relates to the entry into, stay in and departure from the United Kingdom of those who do not have the right under the law of the United Kingdom to enter and remain in the United Kingdom, and to the acquisition and possession of citizenship, as it may deem necessary from time to time.

and

(e) Where at any time there is a lack of suitable accommodation or adequate facilities for a particular individual in any institution in which young offenders are detained or where the mixing of adults and children is deemed to be mutually beneficial, the United Kingdom reserves the right not to apply article 37 (c) in so far as those provisions require children who are detained to be accommodated separately from adults."

"The withdrawal of these reservations in respect of the territory of the United Kingdom is without prejudice to the continued applicability of the reservation and declarations made by the United Kingdom in respect of its dependent territories."

11. a) Amendment to article 43 (2) of the Convention on the Rights of the Child

New York, 12 December 1995

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 18 November 2002, in accordance with article 50(2).
REGISTRATION: 18 November 2002, No. 27531.
STATUS: Parties: 142.
TEXT: Doc. CRC/SP/1995/L.1/Rev.1.

Note: The amendment was proposed by the Government of Costa Rica and circulated by the Secretary-General under cover of depositary notification C.N.138.1995.TREATIES-3 of 22 May 1995 in accordance with article 50 (1) of the Convention. The Conference of the States Parties, convened by the Secretary-General in accordance with article 50 (1) of the Convention, adopted the amendment on 12 December 1995 which was subsequently approved by General Assembly in Resolution No. 155 of 21 December 1995.

Participant	*Acceptance(A), Succession(d)*
Algeria	21 Jan 1998 A
Andorra	17 Jan 1997 A
Argentina	2 Mar 1999 A
Austria	1 Feb 2002 A
Bahamas	23 Oct 2001 A
Bahrain	13 Jun 2000 A
Bangladesh	23 Apr 1997 A
Belarus	23 Sep 2003 A
Belgium	29 Jun 2004 A
Belize	15 Dec 2000 A
Bhutan	17 Mar 1999 A
Bolivia	15 Mar 1999 A
Botswana	6 Mar 2002 A
Brazil	26 Feb 1998 A
Brunei Darussalam	28 Jun 2000 A
Bulgaria	25 Jun 1999 A
Burkina Faso	26 Jul 1999 A
Cambodia	12 Aug 1997 A
Cameroon	5 Oct 2001 A
Canada	17 Sep 1997 A
Chad	16 May 2002 A
Chile	19 Aug 1997 A
China	10 Jul 2002 A
Colombia	31 Jan 1997 A
Congo	28 Feb 2000 A
Costa Rica	12 Feb 1997 A
Côte d'Ivoire	25 Sep 2001 A
Croatia	26 May 1998 A
Cuba	23 Oct 1996 A
Cyprus	20 Sep 2001 A
Czech Republic	23 May 2000 A
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	23 Feb 2000 A
Denmark	10 Sep 1996 A
Djibouti	21 Sep 2001 A
Dominica	5 Jul 2001 A
Ecuador	25 Feb 1998 A
Egypt	28 Dec 1998 A
Estonia	6 Dec 2000 A
Ethiopia	15 Apr 1998 A
Fiji	20 Aug 1997 A
Finland	3 Jan 1997 A
France	20 Jun 1997 A
Georgia	11 Apr 2000 A
Germany	25 Jun 1997 A
Greece	23 Sep 1997 A
Grenada	20 May 1999 A
Guatemala	26 Dec 2002 A
Guinea	14 May 1999 A
Guyana	15 Sep 1998 A
Haiti	20 Dec 2000 A
Holy See	15 Aug 1996 A
Iceland	14 Jan 2000 A
Indonesia	17 Dec 1998 A
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	13 Nov 2001 A
Iraq	31 Dec 2001 A
Ireland	18 Nov 2002 A
Israel	27 Dec 1999 A
Italy	14 Sep 1999 A
Jamaica	6 Apr 1998 A
Japan	12 Jun 2003 A
Jordan	24 Sep 2002 A
Kenya	12 Feb 2003 A
Kiribati	9 Sep 2002 A
Kuwait	9 May 2003 A

Participant	*Acceptance(A), Succession(d)*
Kyrgyzstan	31 May 2000 A
Lao People's Democratic Republic	22 Sep 1997 A
Latvia	15 Nov 2005 A
Lebanon	14 Jul 2000 A
Lesotho	12 Nov 2001 A
Liberia	16 Sep 2005 A
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	24 Sep 2004 A
Liechtenstein	21 Jan 2000 A
Lithuania	27 Mar 2002 A
Luxembourg	11 Jul 2000 A
Malaysia	19 Aug 2002 A
Maldives	2 Nov 1998 A
Mali	4 Mar 1999 A
Malta	1 May 1997 A
Mauritania	20 Aug 1999 A
Mauritius	25 Aug 1999 A
Mexico	22 Sep 1997 A
Moldova	30 Jan 1998 A
Monaco	26 May 1999 A
Mongolia	19 Dec 1997 A
Montenegro[1]	23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	27 Jan 1997 A
Mozambique	4 Mar 1999 A
Myanmar	9 Jun 2000 A
Namibia	11 Dec 2001 A
Netherlands[2]	4 Dec 1996 A
New Zealand[3]	16 Jun 2000 A
Nicaragua	23 Jan 2003 A
Niger	24 Oct 2001 A
Norway	24 Feb 2000 A
Oman	16 Oct 2002 A
Pakistan	19 Jan 2000 A
Palau	26 Apr 2002 A
Panama	5 Nov 1996 A
Paraguay	12 Dec 2003 A
Peru	26 Jan 2000 A
Philippines	14 Jan 1998 A
Poland	2 Sep 1999 A
Portugal	29 Jun 1998 A
Qatar	5 May 1999 A
Republic of Korea	3 Feb 1999 A
Romania	3 Oct 2002 A
Russian Federation	1 May 1998 A
Rwanda	19 Sep 2001 A
Samoa	22 Mar 2002 A
San Marino	10 Oct 2000 A
Saudi Arabia	30 Jun 1997 A
Senegal	5 Nov 2003 A
Serbia	4 Oct 2001 A
Sierra Leone	27 Nov 2001 A
Singapore	29 Mar 2000 A
Slovakia	29 Jul 1999 A
South Africa	5 Aug 1997 A
Spain	13 Jan 1998 A
Sri Lanka	29 Feb 2000 A
Sudan	9 Apr 2001 A
Suriname	23 May 2002 A
Swaziland	17 Jan 2002 A
Sweden	17 Oct 1996 A
Switzerland	2 Dec 1997 A
Syrian Arab Republic	16 Jun 2000 A
Thailand	30 Apr 1998 A
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	16 Oct 1996 A
Togo	19 Jun 1996 A
Trinidad and Tobago	1 Nov 1996 A
Tunisia	29 Mar 2001 A
Turkey	9 Dec 1999 A
Uganda	27 Jun 1997 A
Ukraine	3 Jul 2003 A
United Arab Emirates	11 Nov 1997 A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	17 Jul 1997 A
Uruguay	17 Feb 1999 A
Uzbekistan	25 Apr 1997 A
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	2 Nov 1998 A
Viet Nam	11 Jan 2000 A
Yemen	3 Apr 1997 A
Zambia	9 Aug 2000 A
Zimbabwe	27 Aug 2002 A

Notes:

[1] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe. On 17 December 1997: the Netherlands Antilles. On 18 December 2000: Aruba.

[3] Upon acceptance, the Government of New Zealand declared that “this acceptance shall not extend to Tokelau.”.

11. b) Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict

New York, 25 May 2000

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	12 February 2002, in accordance with article 10(1).
REGISTRATION:	12 February 2002, No. 27531.
STATUS:	Signatories: 124. Parties: 127.
TEXT:	Doc.A/RES/54/263; and C.N.1031.2000.TREATIES-82 of 14 November 2000 [Rectification of the original of the Protocol (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish authentic texts)]; C.N.865.2001.TREATIES-10 of 13 September 2001 [Rectification of the original of the Protocol (Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish authentic texts)].

Note: The Optional Protocol was adopted by resolution A/RES/54/263 of 25 May 2000 at the fifty-fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. In accordance with its article 9 (1), the Optional Protocol will be open for signature by any State that is a party to the Convention or has signed it.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Afghanistan		24 Sep 2003 a
Albania		9 Dec 2008 a
Andorra	7 Sep 2000	30 Apr 2001
Angola		11 Oct 2007 a
Argentina	15 Jun 2000	10 Sep 2002
Armenia	24 Sep 2003	30 Sep 2005
Australia	21 Oct 2002	26 Sep 2006
Austria	6 Sep 2000	1 Feb 2002
Azerbaijan	8 Sep 2000	3 Jul 2002
Bahrain		21 Sep 2004 a
Bangladesh	6 Sep 2000	6 Sep 2000
Belarus		25 Jan 2006 a
Belgium[1]	6 Sep 2000	6 May 2002
Belize	6 Sep 2000	1 Dec 2003
Benin	22 Feb 2001	31 Jan 2005
Bhutan	15 Sep 2005	
Bolivia		22 Dec 2004 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina	7 Sep 2000	10 Oct 2003
Botswana	24 Sep 2003	4 Oct 2004
Brazil	6 Sep 2000	27 Jan 2004
Bulgaria	8 Jun 2001	12 Feb 2002
Burkina Faso	16 Nov 2001	6 Jul 2007
Burundi	13 Nov 2001	24 Jun 2008
Cambodia	27 Jun 2000	16 Jul 2004
Cameroon	5 Oct 2001	
Canada	5 Jun 2000	7 Jul 2000
Cape Verde		10 May 2002 a
Chad	3 May 2002	28 Aug 2002
Chile	15 Nov 2001	31 Jul 2003
China[2,3]	15 Mar 2001	20 Feb 2008
Colombia	6 Sep 2000	25 May 2005
Costa Rica	7 Sep 2000	24 Jan 2003
Croatia	8 May 2002	1 Nov 2002
Cuba	13 Oct 2000	9 Feb 2007
Cyprus	1 Jul 2008	
Czech Republic	6 Sep 2000	30 Nov 2001
Democratic Republic of the Congo	8 Sep 2000	11 Nov 2001
Denmark[4]	7 Sep 2000	27 Aug 2002
Djibouti	14 Jun 2006	
Dominica		20 Sep 2002 a
Dominican Republic	9 May 2002	
Ecuador	6 Sep 2000	7 Jun 2004
Egypt		6 Feb 2007 a
El Salvador	18 Sep 2000	18 Apr 2002
Eritrea		16 Feb 2005 a
Estonia	24 Sep 2003	
Fiji	16 Sep 2005	
Finland	7 Sep 2000	10 Apr 2002
France	6 Sep 2000	5 Feb 2003
Gabon	8 Sep 2000	
Gambia	21 Dec 2000	
Germany	6 Sep 2000	13 Dec 2004
Ghana	24 Sep 2003	
Greece	7 Sep 2000	22 Oct 2003
Guatemala	7 Sep 2000	9 May 2002
Guinea-Bissau	8 Sep 2000	
Haiti	15 Aug 2002	
Holy See	10 Oct 2000	24 Oct 2001
Honduras		14 Aug 2002 a
Hungary	11 Mar 2002	

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Iceland	7 Sep 2000	1 Oct 2001
India	15 Nov 2004	30 Nov 2005
Indonesia	24 Sep 2001	
Iraq		24 Jun 2008 a
Ireland	7 Sep 2000	18 Nov 2002
Israel	14 Nov 2001	18 Jul 2005
Italy	6 Sep 2000	9 May 2002
Jamaica	8 Sep 2000	9 May 2002
Japan	10 May 2002	2 Aug 2004
Jordan	6 Sep 2000	23 May 2007
Kazakhstan	6 Sep 2000	10 Apr 2003
Kenya	8 Sep 2000	28 Jan 2002
Kuwait		26 Aug 2004 a
Kyrgyzstan		13 Aug 2003 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		20 Sep 2006 a
Latvia	1 Feb 2002	19 Dec 2005
Lebanon	11 Feb 2002	
Lesotho	6 Sep 2000	24 Sep 2003
Liberia	22 Sep 2004	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		29 Oct 2004 a
Liechtenstein	8 Sep 2000	4 Feb 2005
Lithuania	13 Feb 2002	20 Feb 2003
Luxembourg	8 Sep 2000	4 Aug 2004
Madagascar	7 Sep 2000	22 Sep 2004
Malawi	7 Sep 2000	
Maldives	10 May 2002	29 Dec 2004
Mali	8 Sep 2000	16 May 2002
Malta	7 Sep 2000	9 May 2002
Mauritius	11 Nov 2001	12 Feb 2009
Mexico	7 Sep 2000	15 Mar 2002
Micronesia (Federated States of)	8 May 2002	
Monaco	26 Jun 2000	13 Nov 2001
Mongolia	12 Nov 2001	6 Oct 2004
Montenegro[5]		2 May 2007 d
Morocco	8 Sep 2000	22 May 2002
Mozambique		19 Oct 2004 a
Namibia	8 Sep 2000	16 Apr 2002
Nauru	8 Sep 2000	
Nepal	8 Sep 2000	3 Jan 2007
Netherlands	7 Sep 2000	
New Zealand[2]	7 Sep 2000	12 Nov 2001
Nicaragua		17 Mar 2005 a
Nigeria	8 Sep 2000	
Norway	13 Jun 2000	23 Sep 2003
Oman		17 Sep 2004 a
Pakistan	26 Sep 2001	
Panama	31 Oct 2000	8 Aug 2001
Paraguay	13 Sep 2000	27 Sep 2002
Peru	1 Nov 2000	8 May 2002
Philippines	8 Sep 2000	26 Aug 2003
Poland	13 Feb 2002	7 Apr 2005
Portugal	6 Sep 2000	19 Aug 2003
Qatar		25 Jul 2002 a
Republic of Korea	6 Sep 2000	24 Sep 2004
Republic of Moldova	8 Feb 2002	7 Apr 2004
Romania	6 Sep 2000	10 Nov 2001
Russian Federation	15 Feb 2001	24 Sep 2008
Rwanda		23 Apr 2002 a
San Marino	5 Jun 2000	
Senegal	8 Sep 2000	3 Mar 2004
Serbia	8 Oct 2001	31 Jan 2003
Seychelles	23 Jan 2001	
Sierra Leone	8 Sep 2000	15 May 2002
Singapore	7 Sep 2000	11 Dec 2008
Slovakia	30 Nov 2001	7 Jul 2006
Slovenia	8 Sep 2000	23 Sep 2004
Somalia	16 Sep 2005	
South Africa	8 Feb 2002	
Spain	6 Sep 2000	8 Mar 2002
Sri Lanka	21 Aug 2000	8 Sep 2000
Sudan	9 May 2002	26 Jul 2005
Suriname	10 May 2002	
Sweden	8 Jun 2000	20 Feb 2003
Switzerland	7 Sep 2000	26 Jun 2002
Syrian Arab Republic		17 Oct 2003 a
Tajikistan		5 Aug 2002 a
Thailand		27 Feb 2006 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	17 Jul 2001	12 Jan 2004
Timor-Leste		2 Aug 2004 a
Togo	15 Nov 2001	28 Nov 2005
Tunisia	22 Apr 2002	2 Jan 2003
Turkey	8 Sep 2000	4 May 2004
Turkmenistan		29 Apr 2005 a
Uganda		6 May 2002 a

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Ukraine	7 Sep 2000	11 Jul 2005
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	7 Sep 2000	24 Jun 2003
United Republic of Tanzania		11 Nov 2004 a
United States of America	5 Jul 2000	23 Dec 2002
Uruguay	7 Sep 2000	9 Sep 2003
Uzbekistan		23 Dec 2008 a
Vanuatu	16 Sep 2005	26 Sep 2007
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	7 Sep 2000	23 Sep 2003
Viet Nam	8 Sep 2000	20 Dec 2001
Yemen		2 Mar 2007 a
Zambia	29 Sep 2008	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declaraitons and reservations were made upon ratification or accession.)

AFGHANISTAN

Declaration:

".....according to the Decree No. 20 dated 25 May 2003 on the voluntary enrollment to the Afghan National Army, signed by H.E. Hamed Karzi Head of State of Afghanistan, the minimum age for recruitment of Afghan Citizen to an active military service is limited by the age of 22 to 28. All recruitments of personnel in the Afghan National Army is voluntary and is not forced or coerced."

ALBANIA

Declaration:

"Pursuant to Article 3 (2) of the Protocol, the Republic of Albania declares that the minimum age at which it permits voluntary recruitment into its national Armed Forces is nineteen years. This age limit is prescribed by Law nr. 9171, dated 22.1.2004.

The age permitted for conscription is established by Article 5, paragraph 2 of the Law no. 9171, dated 22.2.2004."

ANDORRA

Declaration:

With regard to article 3, paragraph 2, of the Protocol, the Principality of Andorra declares that it currently has no armed forces. The only specialized forces in the Principality are those of the Police and Customs, for which the minimum recruitment age is that specified in article 2 of the Optional Protocol. Moreover, the Principality wishes to reiterate in this declaration its disagreement with the content of article 2, in that that article permits the voluntary recruitment of children under the age of 18 years.

ANGOLA

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Angola declares, in accordance with Article 3 of paragraph 2 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, related to Children and Armed Conflict, that in the terms of its Military Service legislation, the inclusion of persons in the Angolan Army, as appropriate, is done upon their reaching 20 years of age, and that the minimum age for voluntary enlistment is 18 years.

ARGENTINA

Declaration:

"The Argentine Republic declares that the minimum age required for voluntary recruitment into the national Armed Forces is eighteen (18) years."

ARMENIA

Declaration:

"According to Article 47 of the Constitution of the Republic of Armenia "Every citizen shall participate in the defence of the Republic of Armenia in a manner prescribed by law.

Participation of the citizens of the Republic of Armenia in the defence of the country is regulated by the laws of the Republic of Armenia on "Military Duty" (15 September 1998) and on "Performance of Military Service" (3 June 2002).

According to Article 4, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the law of the Republic of Armenia on "Performance of Military Service", "the military service consists of active and reserve military services; the active military service consists of obligatory and contractual military service. Obligatory military service means the military service of ranks and officers called up to the armed forces or other forces and of cadets of military schools".

According to Article 11, paragraph 1, of the law of the Republic of Armenia on "Military Duty", male conscripts aged between 18 and 27 and reserve officers of the first group assessed as fit for military service in peace time according to their state of health are required for military service". Based on the above-mentioned laws, the citizens of the Republic of Armenia, who have attained the age of 18, are required to serve in the armed forces of the Republic of Armenia; the Republic of Armenia guarantees that those citizens who have not yet attained the age of 18 cannot be called upon for either obligatory or contractual (voluntary) military service."

AUSTRALIA

Declaration:

"The Australian Defence Force (ADF) shall continue to observe a minimum voluntary recruitment age of 17 years.

Pursuant to Article 3 (5) of the Optional Protocol, age limitations do not apply to military schools. A list of authorised establishments, both military and civilian (including those used to train apprentices), to which this age exemption applies is held by the Service Director-General Career Management. Age limitations also do not apply to cadet schemes, members of which are not recruited into, and are therefore not members of, the ADF.

Persons wishing to join the ADF must present an original certified copy of their birth certificate to their recruiting officer. Before their enlistment or appointment, all ADF applicants who are less than 18 years of age must present the written informed consent of their parents or guardians.

All applicants wishing to join the ADF must be fully informed of the nature of their future duties and responsibilities. Recruiting officers must be satisfied that an application for membership by a person less than 18 years of age is made on a genuinely voluntary basis."

AUSTRIA

Declaration:

Under Austrian law the minimum age for the voluntary recruitment of Austrian citizens into the Austrian army (Bundesheer) is 17 years.

According to paragraph 15, in conjunction with paragraph 65 (c) of the Austrian National Defence Act 1990 (Wehrgesetz 1990), the explicit consent of parents or other legal guardians is required for the voluntary recruitment of a person between 17 and 18 years.

The provisions of the Austrian National Defence Act 1990, together with the subjective legal remedies guaranteed by the Austrian Federal Constitution, ensure that legal protection in the context of such a decision is afforded to volunteers under the age of 18. A further guarantee derives from the strict application of the principles of rule of law, good governance and effective legal protection.

AZERBAIJAN

Declaration:

"Pursuant to Article 3 of the protocol, the Republic of Azerbaijan declares that in accordance with the Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan on the military service of 3 November 1992, the citizens of the Republic of Azerbaijan and other persons, who are meeting the defined requirements of the military service, may voluntarily enter and be admitted in age of 17 the active military service of the cadets military school. The legislation of the Republic of Azerbaijan guarantees that this service shall not be forced or coerced, shall be realized on the basis of deliberative consent of the parents and the legal representatives of those persons, that those persons shall be provided with the full information of the duties regarding this service, and that the documents certifying their age shall be required before the admission to the service in the national armed forces."

BAHRAIN

Declaration:

With reference to Article (3), Paragraph (2) of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child concerning the involvement of children in armed conflict, the Kingdom of Bahrain hereby declares that the minimum age for voluntary recruitment to Bahrain Defence force is 18 years.

BANGLADESH

Declaration:

"In accordance with Article 3 (2) of [the Optional Protocol], the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh declares that the minimum age at which it permits voluntary recruitment into its national Armed Forces is sixteen years for non-commissioned soldiers and seventeen years for commissioned officers, with informed consent of parents or legal guardian, without any exception.

The Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh further provides hereunder a description of the safeguards it has adopted to ensure that such recruitment is not forced or coerced:

The process of recruitment in the national Armed Forces is initiated through advertisement in the national press and the media for officers and other ranks without exception.

The first induction of new recruits is conducted invariably in a public place such as a national park, school ground or a similar place. Public participation is welcomed in such programmes.

Before a recruit presents himself he has to submit a written declaration from his parents or legal guardians consenting to his recruitment. If the parent or legal guardian is illiterate the declaration is verified and counter signed by the Chairmain of the Union Parishad.

The recruit is required to present birth certificate, matriculation certificate and full school records.

All recruits whether officers or other ranks have to undergo rigorous medical examination including checks for puberty. A recruit found to be pre-pubescent is automatically rejected.

Officers and other ranks without exception are required to undergo two years of compulsory training. This ensures that they are not assigned to combat units before the age of 18. All officers and other ranks are carefully screened before being assigned to combat units. These tests include tests of psychological maturity including an understanding of the elements of international law of armed conflict inculcated at all levels.

The Government of the People's Re Bangladesh declares that stringent checks in accordance with the obligations assumed under the Optional Protocol will continue to be applied without exception."

BELARUS

Declaration:

The Republic of Belarus, pursuant to article 3 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, declares that voluntary recruitment of citizens into the armed forces of the Republic of Belarus shall occur upon the attainment by them of 18 years of age.

Admission to a military academy, to which citizens aged 17 years or over, including those who attain 17 years of age during the year in which they are admitted to such an academy, are entitled, in accordance with article 43 of the Act of the Republic of Belarus of 5 November 1992 on Military Obligations and Military Service, shall constitute an exception to the above. Such admission shall not be forced or coerced.

The legislation of the Republic of Belarus guarantees that entry into military service as a cadet at a military academy:

Shall be voluntary;

Shall occur with the informed consent of the person's parents or legal guardians;

Shall occur on condition that such persons are fully informed of the duties involved in military service;

Shall be permitted on condition that such persons provide reliable proof of age prior to acceptance into military service.

BELGIUM[1]

Declarations:

1.In accordance with article 3, paragraph 2, and bearing in mind article 3, paragraph 5, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium states that the minimum age for voluntary recruitment into the Belgian armed forces is not lower than 18 years.

2. The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium states that it is absolutely forbidden under Belgian law for any person under the age of 18 years to participate in times of war and in times of peace in any peacekeeping operation or in any kind of armed operational engagement. Moreover, non-governmental militias are prohibited, regardless of the age of the persons concerned.

3. The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium shall not act upon a request for judicial cooperation where doing so would lead to discrimination between governmental and non-governmental forces in violation of the principle of international humanitarian law of equality of parties to a conflict, including in the event of armed conflict of a non-international nature.

BELIZE

Declaration:

"The Government of Belize declares that in accordance with Article 3 of the Protocol, the minimum age at which voluntary recruitment to any military service in Belize shall be permitted is sixteen years. In recruiting among persons who have attained sixteen years but less than eighteen years, the following principles are to be observed:

1. Such recruitment is to be genuinely voluntary and reliable proof of age must be given;
2. Such persons are to receive the informed consent of his/her parent or guardian;
3. Such persons are, before being recruited, well-informed of the duties involved in the military service;
4. Such persons may be able to withdraw from the military service within the first month of having enlisted."

BENIN

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Benin declares that the minimum age at which it permits the recruitment of volunteers into the armed forces and the national gendarmerie is eighteen (18) years (cf. article 13 of Act No. 63-5 of 30 May 1963 on recruitment in the Republic of Benin).

The Government of the Republic of Benin also indicates below the safeguards that it has adopted to ensure that such recruitment is in no event forced or coerced:

(a) The process of recruitment into the Beninese Armed Forces and the national gendarmerie is initiated by an announcement in the national press and news media for young persons;

(b) The recruitment file is composed, as appropriate, inter alia, of a birth certificate, a certificate of school attendance and/or a certificate of apprenticeship;

(c) The induction of young persons takes place in public, at a sports ground or a similar location;

(d) All recruits undergo a rigorous medical examination.

BOLIVIA

Declaration:

Bolivia declares that, under its legislation in force, the minimum age for compulsory military service in the armed forces is 18 years. As for pre-military service, it is a voluntary alternative available for young persons from the age of 17 years.

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Declaration:

"The State of Bosnia and Herzegovina will not permit voluntary recruitment into its national armed forces of any person under age of 18. Such provision is incorporated into the Law on Defense of Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina ("Official Gazette of Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina" No. 15/96, 23/02, 18/03) and Law on Army of Republika Srpska ("Official gazette of Republika Srpska" No 31/96, 96/01), and is in compliance with Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child that was ratified by Bosnia and Herzegovina."

BOTSWANA

Declaration:

"The Government of the Republic of Botswana declares, pursuant to Article 3 (2), of the Optional Protocol, that:

a) There is no compulsory conscription into the Defence Force.

b) The process of recruitment in the Defence Force is initiated through advertisement in the national press in which the minimum age limit of 18 years is stipulated as one of the requirements.

c) The induction of all recruits is conducted in public.

d) All recruits are required to present a national identity card which states their date of birth, school completion certificate, and other educational records where necessary.

e) All recruits undergo a rigorous medical examination where pre-pubescence would be noticed, and any person determined to be underage is routinely rejected from recruitment."

BRAZIL

Declaration:

"With regard to article 3, paragraph 2, of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, the Brazilian Government declares that, according to article 143 of the Federal Constitution, military service is compulsory, as set forth by law. The Constitution also provides that it is within the competence of the Armed Forces, according to the law, to assign an alternative service to those who, in times of peace, after being enlisted, claim imperative of conscience. Women and clergymen are exempt from compulsory military service in times of peace, but are subject to other duties assigned by law.

According to the Military Service Act (Law no 4.375, of 17 August 1964), the obligation to military service, in times of peace, begins the 1st January of the year the citizen becomes 18 years old (article 5). Pursuant to the Regulation of the Military Service (Decree no 57.654, of 20 January 1966), citizens may freely present themselves to voluntary military service provided they have the minimum age of 16 years (article 41, paragraph 1 and article 49, paragraph 4).

However, their acceptance to voluntary military service is only possible from the 1st January of the year they become 17 years old (article 127). The acceptance of voluntaries to Military Service requires special authorization from the Armed Forces (Military Service Act, article 27).

Pursuant to the Regulation of the Military Service, the civil incapacity to act, to the purposes of military service, ends on the date the citizen becomes 17 years old. Voluntaries who, upon the act of incorporation or enrollment to the military service, have not yet completed 17 years old, must present written consent from parents or guardians (article 239)."

BULGARIA

Declaration:

The Republic of Bulgaria declares hereby that all men, Bulgarian citizens who have attained 18 years of age shall be subject to a compulsory military service.

Bulgarian citizens who have been sworn in and done their military service or have done two thirds of the mandatory term of their military service shall be admitted, voluntarily, to regular duty.

Persons who have not come of age shall be trained at military schools subject to the conclusion of a training agreement to be signed by them with the consent of their parents or guardians. Having come of age, the trainees shall sign a training agreement on a regular military duty.

BURKINA FASO

Declaration:

The Government of Burkina Faso, pursuant to article 3 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, hereby declares that the minimum age for voluntary recruitment into its national armed forces is 18.

Recruitment is voluntary and such persons must provide reliable proof of age.

They are fully informed, prior to recruitment, of the duties involved in such military service.

The Government of Burkina Faso hereby states that it is forbidden for any person under the age of 18 to participate in times of war and in times of peace in any peacekeeping operation or in any kind of armed operational engagement.

BURUNDI

Declaration:

With regard to Article 3 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, the Government of the Republic of Burundi declares that the minimum age at which it permits voluntary recruitment into its national defence forces is eighteen (18) years (cf. article 1 of Act no. 67-8 of 30 October 1963 on recruitment in the Republic of Burundi).

The Government of the Republic of Burundi further notes that it has adopted the following safeguards to ensure that such recruitment is neither forced nor coerced:

(a) Recruitment into the national defence forces and the national police of Burundi is initiated through announcements in the national media for young men and women;

(b) Prospective recruits are required to provide, inter alia, a birth certificate, proof of school attendance, and/or apprenticeship certificate;

(c) The enlistment ceremony for young people is conducted in public, at a sports field or other similar venue;

(d) All recruits undergo a thorough medical examination.

CAMBODIA

Declaration:

"According to Article 42 of the Law on the General Status of Royal Cambodian Armed Forces stipulated that the Cambodian citizen of either sex who has attained the age of 18 years should be permitted or recruited into the armed forces."

CANADA

Declaration:

"Pursuant to article 3, paragraph 2, of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on Involvement of Children in Armed Conflicts, Canada hereby declares:

1. The Canadian Armed Forces permit voluntary recruitment at the minimum age of 16 years.

2. The Canadian Armed Forces have adopted the following safeguards to ensure that recruitment of personnel under the age of 18 years is not forced or coerced:

(a) all recruitment of personnel in the Canadian Forces is voluntary. Canada does not practice conscription or any form of forced or obligatory service. In this regard, recruitment campaigns of the Canadian Forces are informational in nature. If an individual wishes to enter the Canadian Forces, he or she fills in an application. If the Canadian Forces offer a particular position to the candidate, the latter is not obliged to accept the position;

(b) recruitment of personnel under the age of 18 is done with the informed and written consent of the person's parents or legal guardians. Article 20, paragraph 3, of the National Defence Act states that 'a person under the age of eighteen years shall not be enrolled without the consent of one of the parents or the guardian of that person',

(c) personnel under the age of 18 are fully informed of the duties involved in military service. The Canadian Forces provide, among other things, a series of informational brochures and films on the duties involved in military service to those who wish to enter the Canadian Forces; and

(d) personnel under the age of 18 must provide reliable proof of age prior to acceptance into national military service. An applicant must provide a legally recognized document, that is an original or a certified copy of their birth certificate or baptismal certificate, to prove his or her age."

CAPE VERDE

Declaration:

[The Republic of Cape Verde] declare[s] on behalf of the Cape Verdean Government, that the minimum age for special voluntary recruitment into the Cape Verdean armed forces is 17 years in accordance with article 31 of Legislative Decree No. 6/93 of 24 May 1993, published in official gazette No.18, series I.

Moreover, Decree-Law No. 37/96 of 30 September 1986, published in official gazette No. 32, series I, which governs the provisions contained in the above-mentioned Legislative Decree, states the following in its article 60:

Special recruitment … shall apply to citizens, who of their own freely expressed will, decide to enter military service subject to meeting the following requirements:

(a) They must have attained the minimum age of 17 years;

(b) They must have the consent of their parents or legal guardians;

c) They must be mentally and physically fit for military service.

Article 17 of Legislative Decree No. 6/93 and articles 29 and 63 of Decree-Law No. 37/96 provide that persons to be enrolled must be fully informed through appropriate documentation prepared by the high command of the armed forces about the duties involved in national military service.

Under article 28 of that Decree-Law, all volunteers shall provide, prior to enlistment and as reliable proof of identity, their national identity card or passport.

While article 8 of Legislative Decree No. 6/93 provides that in war time the minimum/maximum age for recruitment may be amended, the fact that Cape Verde is bound by the Convention on the Rights of the Child and is becoming a party to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, means that in no case shall the minimum age for recruitment be lower than 17 years. Indeed, article 12, paragraph 4, of the Constitution provides that the norms and principles of general international law and international treaty law duly approved or ratified shall take prece, after their entry into force in the international and domestic legal system, over all domestic municipal legislative or normative acts under the Constitution.

CHAD

Declaration:

The Chadian Government declares that, pursuant to article 3, paragraph 2 of the Optional Protocol, the minimum age for recruitment into the armed forces is 18 years.

Enlistment is entirely and absolutely voluntary and may take place only on a fully informed basis.

CHILE[6]

13 November 2008

Declaration:

Pursuant to the provisions of article 3, paragraph 4, of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict, the Republic of Chile is amending the declaration made when it deposited the instrument of ratification of the Protocol, as follows:

"The Government of Chile declares that, in accordance with its internal legislation, the minimum age for voluntary recruitment into its national armed forces is 18 years. As an exception, persons who are 17 years of age may, at their request, advance by one year their ordinary conscription into military service, although they may not be mobilized before they have reached the age of 18."

CHINA

Declaration:

1. The minimum age for citizens voluntarily entering the Armed Forces of the People's Republic of China is 17 years of age.

2. The Government of the People's Republic of China is applying the following safeguard measures in implementing the foregoing provision:

(1) The Military Service Law of the People's Republic of China provides that each year, male citizens who have reached 18 years of age by 31 December shall be recruited for active service. To meet the needs of the armed forces and on the principle of voluntary participation, male and female citizens who have not yet reached 18 years of age by 31 December of a given year may be recruited for active service. Citizens eligible for enlistment who have registered for military service but who have not been recruited for active service shall serve in the enlistees reserves, for which the minimum age is 18. The Regulations on the Recruitment of Soldiers formulated by the State Council and the Central Military Commission of the People's Republic of China on the basis of the Military Service Law of the People's Republic of China, provides that in order to meet the needs of the armed forces and on the principle of voluntary participation, male and female citizens who have not yet reached 17 years of age by 31 December of a given year may be recruited for active service.

(2) The Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China provides that whoever engages in favouritism and commits irregularities in conscription work or accepts or delivers unqualified recruits shall be sentenced to not more than three years of fixed-term imprisonment or criminal detention, if the circumstances are serious; such an offender is to be sentenced to not less than three years but not more than seven years of fixed-term imprisonment if the consequences are especially serious.

(3) Under the provisions of the Regulations on Honest and Non-Corrupt Recruitment, formulated by the State Council and the Central Military Commission of the People's Republic of China, neither the loosening of recruitment conditions nor the lowering of enlistment standards are to be allowed. They further provide for the implementation of a system of visiting the homes and work units of youth who enlist, and for verifying the ages of enlisting youth.

COLOMBIA

Declaration:

The military forces of Colombia, in application of the norms of international humanitarian law for the protection of the best interests of the child and in application of domestic legislation, do not recruit minors in age into their ranks, even if they have the consent of their parents.

Act 418 of 1997, extended through Act 548 of 1999 and amended by Act 642 of 2001, stipulates that persons under 18 years of age shall not be recruited to perform military service. Students in the eleventh grade who are minors, in accordance with Act 48 of 1993, and who are selected to perform such service, shall defer their enlistment until they have reached age 18.

If, on reaching majority, the youth who has deferred military service shall have been matriculated or admitted to an undergraduate programme in an institution of higher education, he shall have the option of serving his duty immediately or deferring it until completion of his studies. If he should choose to serve immediately, the educational institution shall reserve a space for him under the same conditions; if he should choose to defer, the corresponding degree may be granted only when his military service has been completed as ordered by law. Interruption of higher-level studies shall entail the obligation of enlistment into military service.

Civilian or military authorities who disregard this provision shall be subject to dismissal on grounds of misconduct.

The youth recruited who has deferred his military service until completion of his professional studies shall fulfil his constitutional duty as a graduate professional or technician in the service of the armed forces in activities of social service to the community, public works and tasks of a scientific or technical nature as required in the respective unit to which he has been assigned. In such case, military service shall be of six months' duration and shall be credited as the rural service year, practicum, industrial semester, year of court internship, obligatory social service or similar academic requirements that the programme of study establishes as a degree requirement. For those entering a law career, such military service may replace the thesis or monograph for the degree and in any case, shall replace the obligatory social service referred to in article 149 of Act 446 of 1998.

COSTA RICA

Declaration:

... article 12 of the Constitution of the Republic of Costa Rica proscribes the army as a permanent institution. Accordingly, my Government considers that the declaration in question may be dispensed with for the purposes of article 3, paragraph 2, of the Protocol.

CROATIA

Declaration:

"... The Republic of Croatia makes the following declaration in relation to Article 3, paragraph 2, of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflicts:

"Related to Article 3, paragraph 2 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflicts, the Republic of Croatia states that Croatian legislation prevents persons under 18 from joining the Armed Forces of the Republic of Croatia.

In order to ensure that persons under 18 do not join its Armed Forces, the Republic of Croatia has made the following provisions:

- It has been stipulated by law that military service consists of duty to register as a recruit, to enter military service (conscription), and to serve in the reserves in the Armed Forces of the Republic of Croatia;
- The duty to register as a recruit arises in the calendar year in which a person turns 18, and remains until the person enters military service (conscription) or service in civilian life i.e. until the person is transferred to the reserves or until military service ceases pursuant to the provisions of the Defence Act. The process of recruitment includes registration in the military records, medical and other examinations, psychological tests and recruitment itself. It is a preliminary procedure required in order to determine whether a person is eligible for military service. The status of the recruit remains valid until entering military service (conscription) to which, according to the law, a recruit may not be sent before reaching the age of 18;
- Eligible recruits are sent to do their military service (conscription) after they come of age (turn 18), normally in the calendar year in which they turn 19, thereby becoming conscripts. Recruits are not part of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Croatia; conscripts make one component of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Croatia."

CUBA

Declaration:

With respect to article 3, paragraph 2, of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, the Government of the Republic of Cuba declares binding the minimum age of 17 for voluntary recruitment into its armed forces. It also declares that the guarantees and safeguards for this provision are contained in Act No. 75 (the National Defence Act) of 21 December 1994 and Decree-Law No. 224 (the Active Military Service Act) of 15 October 2001.

CYPRUS

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"Pursuant to Article 3, paragraph 2, of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of Children in Armed Conflict, done at New York on 25 May 2000, the Republic of Cyprus declares:

1. The National Guard Law No. 20 of 1964, as variously amended, most recently in 2006, hereinafter "The National Guard Law", provides that the obligation to military service, in times of peace, begins on 1 January of the year the citizen becomes 18 years old. Although military service is compulsory for all Cypriot citizens, women and some categories of males (e.g. clergymen) are exempted

from military service in times of peace.

2. The National Guard Law also provides for the voluntary enlistment of citizens under 18 years of age who have attained the age of 17 by the date of their recruitment in the armed forces. The acceptance of volunteers to Military Service requires special authorization from the Minister of Defense. Volunteers must have recent written consent from their parents or legal guardians.

3. The recruitment, on a voluntary basis, by the armed forces at the minimum age of 17 years shall continue to be permitted under the conditions and with the safeguards provided in Article 3, paragraph 3, of the Optional Protocol.

4. Proof of age prior to recruitment is presented through the application of Section 4A of the National Guard Law providing for mandatory registration for all citizens with the appropriate authorities in the District of their normal residence once they reach the age of 16. Section 4A of the Law specifies that the data must be submitted in a written form and include, among others, details on the place and date of birth. It is a punishable offence to submit erroneous data at the time of registration.

5. The Republic of Cyprus understands that Article 1 of the Optional Protocol would not prevent members of its armed forces to be deployed where:

a. There is a genuine military need to deploy their unit to an area in which hostilities are taking place; and

b. By reason of the nature and urgency of the situation:

(i) it is not practicable to withdraw such persons before deployment; or

(ii) to do so would undermine the operational effectiveness of their unit, and thereby put at risk the successful conduct of the military mission and/or the safety of other personnel.

The above understanding is all the more necessary under the circumstances prevailing nowadays in the Republic of Cyprus as a result of the continued illegal military occupation of 37% of its national territory by a foreign State, Party to the Optional Protocol."

CZECH REPUBLIC

Declaration:

Adopting this Protocol we declare in accordance with article 3 paragraph 2 of the Protocol that the minimum age at which voluntary recruitment into its national armed forces is permitted is 18 years. This age limit is prescribed by law.

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

Declaration:

Pursuant to article 3, paragraph 2, of the Protocol, the Democratic Republic of the Congo undertakes to implement the principle of prohibiting the recruitment of children into the armed forces, in accordance with Decree-Law No. 066 of 9 June 2000 on the demobilization and rehabilitation of vulnerable groups on active service in the armed forces, and to take all feasible measures to ensure that persons who have not yet attained the age of 18 years are not recruited in any way into the Congolese armed forces or into any other public or private armed group throughout the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

DENMARK

Declaration:

"In connection with the deposit of Denmark's instrument of ratification of the Optional Protocol on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict [the Government of Denmark declares] that Danish legislation does not permit the recruitment of any person below the age of 18 in the arrmed forces."

DOMINICA

Declarations:

"... the minimum age at which voluntary recruitment will be permitted into the Police Force (in the absence of national and armed forces) is eighteen (18) years in accordance with the Police Act, Chapter 14:01, Section 5 (a);

... recruitment will be carried out only through a recognized registered body;

... the consent of recruits is voluntary and is witnessed to with a signed declaration;

... an orientation period is provided prior to recruitment with the option of voluntary withdawal."

ECUADOR

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Ecuador hereby declares that, in accordance with the provisions of its Constitution, military service is compulsory. Citizens who invoke conscientious objection on moral, religious or philosophical grounds are assigned to community service, in the manner prescribed by the law.

Article 5 of the Act on Compulsory Military Service states that “military obligations begin, for Ecuadorian citizens, at 18 years of age, and end at 55 years of age. The period between the ages of 18 and 55 shall be called 'military age' ”.

EGYPT

Declaration :

The Arab Republic of Egypt hereby declares that in accordance with its current laws the minimum age for conscription into the armed forces of Egypt is 18 years and the minimum age for voluntary recruitment into the armed forces is 16 years.

The Arab Republic of Egypt is committed to ensuring that voluntary recruitment is genuine and entirely willing, with the informed consent of the parents or legal guardians after the volunteers have been fully informed of the duties included in such voluntary military service and based on reliable evidence of the age of volunteers.

EL SALVADOR

Declaration:

... pursuant to article 3, paragraph 2 of the abovementioned Protocol, the Government of the Republic of El Salvador declares that the minimum age for Salvadorans who wish to enlist voluntarily for military service is 16 years, in accordance with articles 2 and 6 of the Act on Military Service and Reserves of the Armed Forces of El Salvador. The following is a description of the safeguards that the relevant Salvadoran authorities have adopted to ensure that the military service provided is legally voluntary:

- The 16-year-old minor must submit a written request to the Recruitment and Reserves Office or its subsidiary offices, unequivocally stating a desire to provide military service;
- Submission of the original birth certificate or minor's card;
- Document certifying knowledge of and consent to the request to provide military service from the minor's parents, guardian or legal representative, all in accordance with the provisions of title II on parental authority, article 206 et seq. of the Family Code;
- Acceptance of the request shall be subject to the needs for military service.

ERITREA

Declaration:

"The State of Eritrea declares that the minimum age for the recruitment of persons into the armed forces is eighteen years."

FINLAND

Declaration:

"The Government of Finland declares in accordance with Article 3, paragraph 2, of the Optional Protocol that the minimum age for any recruitment of persons into its national armed forces is 18 years. The minimum age applies equally to the military service of men and to the voluntary service of women."

FRANCE

Declaration:

France hereby declares that it recruits only volunteers aged at least 17 who have been informed of the rights and duties involved in military service and that the enlistment of recruits under the age of 18 is valid only with the consent of their legal representatives.

GERMANY

Declaration:

The Federal Republic of Germany declares that it considers a minimum age of 17 years to be binding for the voluntary recruitment of soldiers into its armed forces under the terms of Article 3 paragraph 2 of the Optional Protocol. Persons under the age of 18 years shall be recruited into the armed forces solely for the purpose of commencing military training.

The protection of voluntary recruits under the age of 18 years in connection with their decision to join the armed forces is ensured by the need to obtain the consent of their legal guardian and the indispensable requirement that they present an identification card or passport as a reliable proof of their age.

GREECE

Declaration:

"Pursuant to article 3, paragraph 2 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflicts, Greece declares that the minimum age at which voluntary recruitment in the Greek armed forces is permitted by national law, is 18 years."

GUATEMALA

Declaration:

In conformity with article 3, paragraph 2 of the aforementioned Protocol, the Government of Guatemala makes the following declaration: ‘Guatemala shall not permit the compulsory recruitment of persons under 18 years of age into its armed forces, and, in keeping with article 3, paragraph 4, of the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, the description of the safeguards it has adopted to ensure that such recruitment is not forced or coerced shall be submitted at a later date.

HOLY SEE

Declaration:

"The Holy See, with regard to article 3, paragraph 2, of the Protocol, declares that, for what concerns the Vatican City State, the Regulations of the Pontifical Swiss Guard, approved in 1976, establish that the recruitment of its members is only voluntary and that the minimum age is set forth at 19 years."

HONDURAS

Declaration:

With the aim of specifying the scope of this Protocol and upon depositing its instrument of accession, the Government of the Republic of Honduras, acting in accordance with article 3 of the Protocol, declares that:

1 (a). Under the legislation of the State of Honduras, the minimum age for voluntary recruitment into the armed forces is 18 years, as part of the country's educational, social, humanist and democratic system".

II. This Agreement shall be submitted to the Sovereign National Congress for consideration, for the purposes of article 205, number 30, of the Constitution of the Republic.

ICELAND

Declaration:

“With regard to Article 3, paragraph 2, of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvment of Children in Armed Conflict, the Republic of Iceland declares that it has no national armed forces, and hence, a minum age for recruitment is not applicable in the case of the Republic of Iceland.”

INDIA

Declarations:

"Pursuant to article 3 (2) of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of Children in Armed Conflict, the Government of the Republic of India declare that:

(i) The minimum age for recruitment of prospective recruits into Armed Forces of India (Army, Air Force and Navy) is 16 years. After enrollment and requisite training period, the attested Armed Forces personnel is sent to the operational area only after he attains 18 years of age;

(ii) The recruitment into the Armed Forces of India is purely voluntary and conducted through open rally system/open competitive examinations. There is no forced or coerced recruitment into the Armed Forces."

IRAQ

Declaration:

Pursuant to article 3, paragraph 2 of the Protocol, the Government of the Republic of Iraq:

(a) Declares that the minimum age at which it permits voluntary recruitment into its national armed forces is 18 years;

(b) Sets forth below a description of the safeguards it has adopted to ensure that such recruitment is not forced or coerced:

- Such recruitment must be genuinely voluntary;
- Volunteers must present reliable proof of age prior to acceptance into the national armed forces.

IRELAND

Declaration:

"Pursuant to article 3, paragraph 2, of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflicts, Ireland declares:

In general, the minimum age for recruitment into the Irish armed forces is 17. An exception is made in the case of apprentices, who may be recruited at the age of 16. However, apprentices are not assigned to any military duties until they have completed up to four years apprenticeship trade training, by which time all would have attained the age of 18.

Ireland has adopted the following safeguards to ensure that recruitment of personnel under the age of 18 is not forced or coerced:

All recruitment to the Irish armed forces is voluntary. Ireland does not practice conscription and recruitment campaigns are informational in nature. Applicants must fill in an application and are selected on the basis of suitability. Applicants who are offered a position are under no obligation to accept that position.

All applicants are required to provide proof of age. All unmarried applicants who are under 18 must have the written consent of a parent or guardian. In Ireland a person attains full age or adulthood either on attaining the age of 18 or upon marriage if they marry before that age. Under Irish law a person who is under the age of 18 years may not enter into a valid marriage unless an exemption is granted by the Circuit or High Court."

ISRAEL

Declarations:

"The Government of the State of Israel declares pursuant to article 3 (2) of the Optional Protocol on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict that:

(a) The minimum age in which the State of Israel permits voluntary recruitment into its armed forces is 17 years of age, according to article 14 of the defense service law (consolidated version) 5746-1986;

(b) The Government of the State of Israel maintains the following safeguards in respect of voluntary recruitment into the armed forces so as to ensure that such recruitment is not forced or coerced:

1. In accordance with section 14 of the defense service law (consolidated version) 5746-1986, no person under 18 years of age may enlist in the Israeli armed forces without a written application submitted by the person and the written consent of the person's parents or legal guardian; however, should there be an appreciable difficulty in contacting one of the parents, the written consent of the other parent is sufficient;
2. Clear and precise explanation of the nature of the duties involved in military service is provided to both the person and the person's parents or legal guardian;
3. Prior to acceptance of any person into the Israeli armed forces a reliable proof of age is obtained through the Ministry of the Interior's official national population registry.
4. The IDF has several long-term programs in which participants may engage in academic or rabbinic studies or perform volunteer work, prior to the commencement of their actual military service. Enrollment in these programs is open to participants from the age of 17.5. For administrative purposes, these participants undergo a one-day administrative induction into the armed forces. Following their administrative induction, these participants are released from active service and enroll in their chosen program.
5. Persons under 18 years of age, who enlist in one of the aforementioned ways, may in no case be posted to combat duty.”

ITALY

Declaration:

The Government of the Italian Republic declares, in compliance with article 3:

- That Italian legislation on voluntary recruitment provides that a minimum age of 17 years shall be required with respect to requests for early recruitment for compulsory military service or voluntary recruitment (military duty on a short-term and yearly basis);
- That the legislation in force guarantees the application, at the time of voluntary recruitment, of the provisions of article 3, paragraph 3, of the Protocol, inter alia, as regards the requirement of the consent of the parent or guardian of the recruit.

JAMAICA

Declaration:

"Pursuant to Article 3 (2) of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of Children in Armed Conflict, Jamaica hereby declares that:

1. The Jamaica Defence Force permits voluntary recruitment and enlistment at the minimum age of 18 years.

2. The Jamaica Defence Force has adopted the following safeguards, under the 1962 Defence (Regular Force Enlistment And Service Regulations) Act, to ensure that recruitment of personnel under the age of 18 is not forced or coerced;

(a) All recruitment to the Jamaica Defence Force is voluntary. If an individual wishes to enter the Jamaica Defence Force, he or she completes the relevant application (Notice Paper) form in accordance with Section 5 of the Act;

(b) The applicant is given the notice paper with the condition and warning that if he knowingly makes a false attestation, he is liable to be punished;

(c) The recruiting officer shall satisfy himself that the person offering to enlist is, or as the case may be, is not, over the age of eighteen years;

(d) The recruiting officer shall read or cause to be read to the person the questions set out in the attestation paper and shall ensure that the answers are duly recorded thereon;

(e) Written parental consent is required for applicants who have attained the age of 171/2 years. Persons in this category are not permitted to graduate as trained soldiers from training institutions, until they have attained the age of eighteen (18) years.

3. Personnel must provide reliable proof of age prior to acceptance into national military service, in the form of a legally recognized document, that is, an original or a certified copy of their birth certificate.

If the Jamaica Defence Force offers a particular position to the candidate, he or she is not compelled to accept the position."

JAPAN

Declaration:

"In accordance with article 3, paragraph 2 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, the Government of Japan declares as follows:

The Government of Japan, by relevant laws and regulations, recruits only those who are at and above the minimum age of 18 as a member of the Japan Self-Defense Forces, with the exception of the cases of the students solely receiving educational training at the schools within the structure of the Japan Self-Defense Forces (hereinafter referred to as "the Youth Cadets"), which come under "schools"stipulated in Article 3, paragraph 5 of the Optional Protocol.

The minimum age of recruitment of the Youth Cadets is 15 years.

In Japan, the safeguards to ensure that the recruitment of the Youth Cadets is not forced or coerced are as follows:

1. In accordance with the provisions of the Law on the Japan Self-Defense Forces (Law No 165/1954), the recruitment of personnel of the Japan Self-Defense Forces including the Youth Cadets is required to be based upon examination or selection, and it is prohibited to use such measures as threat, compulsion and similar means with the intention of realizing unjust recruitment of the members.

2. Further, in recruiting the Youth Cadets, the following shall be confirmed beforehand in accordance with the Instruction on the recruitment of the students of the Japan Self-Defense Forces (Japan Defense Agency Instruction No 51/1955).

(1) Either the person who executes the parental authority over a Youth Cadet or his/her guardian gives consent to the recruitment.

(2) The candidate for a Youth Cadet is fully informed of the duties to be involved in advance.

(3) A proof of the age of the Youth Cadets for being at or over 15 years is provided by a certifying document.

KAZAKHSTAN

Declaration:

"Pursuant to article 3, paragraph 2, of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on Involvement of Children in Armed Conflicts, the Republic of Kazakhstan hereby declares:

In accordance with the Military Service on Contract Basis Act No. 167-II 3PK of March 20, 2001:

1. Military Service on Contract Basis grounded on the principles of legitimacy, voluntary recruitment, professionalism and competency, social security and protection of rights of military servants.

2. Every military servant is entitled in full equality in his or her rights. No one shall be limited in his or her rights or attain any advantages realising the rights with regard to sex, age, race, nationality, language, religion, official capacity and social status.

3. Article 17, paragraph 1 permits voluntary recruitment at the minimum age of 19.

4. According to the article 14, paragraph 1 a contract should obligatory include description of the identification document, number and date of issue of the document, number of social individual code and tax-payer's registration number."

KENYA

Declaration:

"The Government of the Republic of Kenya declares that the minimum age for the recruitment of persons into the armed forces is by law set at eighteen years. Recruitment is entirely and genuinely voluntary and is carried out with the full informed consent of the persons being recruited. There is no conscription in Kenya.

The Government of the Republic of Kenya reserves the right at any time by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to add, amend or strengthen the present declaration. Such notifications shall take effect from the date of their receipt by the Secretary General of the United Nations."

KUWAIT

Declaration:

... the Government of the State of Kuwait is committed to maintaining the minimum age for voluntary service in the Kuwaiti armed forces at 18 years of age, and to prohibiting the forced conscription of any persons under the age of 18, pursuant to article 3, paragraph 2 of the aforementioned Protocol.

KYRGYZSTAN

Declaration:

"In accordance with the Article 3, paragraph 2 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, adopted in New York, 25 May 2000, I have the honour to declare that in the Kyrgyz Republic the minimum age for recruitment of its citizens (men) to an active military service is limited by the age of 18 years (Article 10 of the Law of the Kyrgyz Republic "On the general military service of citizens of the Kyrgyz Republic")."

LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Declaration:

"In accordance with the Law of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the minimum age at which it will permit voluntary recruitment into its national armed forces is 18 (eighteen). The law on obligations of national defense service stipulates in Article 13 that 'all young men of Lao nationality between 18 (eighteen) and 28 (twenty-eight) years of age, having good health conditions, shall be obliged to serve for a short-term in national defense forces. In case of necessity, young women between 18 (eighteen) and 23 (twenty-three) years of age may also be called upon to serve for a short-term in national defense; and in Article 7 that following health check-up, there shall be a selection process at a district level to select voluntary recruits, with good health, into short-term defense services, according to the recruitment number officially set forth on a yearly basis.' "

LATVIA

Declaration:

"1) according to the Article 17 paragraph 1 of the Mandatory Military Service Law adopted by the Parliament of the Republic of Latvia on 19th day of February 1997 citizens from the age of 19 years to the age of 27 years shall be liable for mandatory active military service;

2) according to the Article 17 paragraph 2 of the Mandatory Military Service Law male and female persons from the age of 18 years to the age of 27 years may enlist voluntarily for mandatory active military service."

LESOTHO

Declaration:

"In response to article 3 (2) of the Optional Protocol, in accordance with the Lesotho Defence Force Act of 1996, section 18 thereof, the minimum age at which the Government of Lesotho permits voluntary recruitment into the national armed forces is when the interested person has already attained the age of 18.

Such recruitment is voluntary as would be recruits submit applications for advertised vacancies in the armed forces."

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA

Declaration:

...the required legal age for volunteering to serve in the armed forces of the Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, according to the national legislation thereof, is eighteen years.

LIECHTENSTEIN

Declaration:

"The Principality of Liechtenstein declares that, with respect to the Principality of Liechtenstein, articles 1 and 2 as well as article 3, in particular paragraph 2, of the Optional Protocol of 25 May 2000 to the Convention on the Rights of the Child of 20 November 1989 on the involvement of children in armed conflict have to be understood in light of the fact that the Principality of Liechtenstein has no national armed forces and that hence no legislation on a minimum age for the recruitment of persons into the armed forces and for taking part in hostilities exists. The Principality of Liechtenstein regards the ratification of the Optional Protocol as part of its continuing commitment to the protection of the rights of children and at the same time as an act of its solidarity with the objectives of the said Protocol."

LITHUANIA

Declaration:

".....the Republic of Lithuania declares that under Republic of Lithuania law the citizens of the Republic of Lithuania under the age of 18 years may not serve in the national armed forces: the minimum age of citizens of the Republic of Lithuania for voluntary recruitment into the active military service is 18 years, and the minimum age of citizens of the Republic of Lithuania for enlisting into the mandatory military service must be 19 years. Compulsory recruitment of children under the age of 18 years into the national armed forces shall involve liability under law of the Republic of Lithuania."

LUXEMBOURG

Declaration:

The Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg declares that, in accordance with article 3 of the Protocol, the minimum age at which voluntary recruitment to the army of Luxembourg shall be permitted is 17 years.

The following principles shall be observed in recruiting persons aged 17 years:

1. Recruitment shall be on a voluntary basis.
2. Voluntary recruits under the age of 18 must have the written consent of their parents or legal guardian.
3. Voluntary recruits under the age of 18 may not take part in the following military operations:

(1) At the national level:

(a) The defence of the Grand Duchy's territory in the event of armed conflict.

(2) At the international level:

(a) Contributing to the collective or common defence within the framework of the international organizations of which the Grand Duchy is a member;

(b) Taking part within such a framework in humanitarian and evacuation missions, peacekeeping missions, and combat missions for crisis management, including peacemaking operations.

4. Voluntary recruits shall be fully informed, prior to their recruitment, of the duties connected with military service.
5. Voluntary recruits may withdraw from their military service at any time.

MADAGASCAR

Declaration:

Pursuant to article 11 of Edict No. 78-002 of 16 February 1978 on the general principles governing National Service, young men and women aged 18 years or more may request to be recruited into the Armed Forces or outside the Armed Forces before young men and women of their age-group. Any citizen may, from the age of 18 onwards, enlist in the Armed Forces for an indefinite period.

In order to preserve his or her contractual liberty, the person requesting voluntary enlistment shall submit a request approved by his or her parents or legal guardian. Offences against the requirements of these provisions shall be prosecuted and penalized under the Code of Justice on National Service or the Penal Code.

MALDIVES

Declaration:

"1. The Minimum age at which the Maldives permits recruitment to its National Security Service and its Police Service is 18 years.

2. Any individual who wishes to enter the National Security Service and the Police Service has to apply for it in writing.

3. All applicants are required to present proof of birth date.

4. All applicants short listed for recruitment are carefully screened for medical fitness. "

MALI

Declaration:

In accordance with article 3, paragraph 2, of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict, the Government of the Republic of Mali declares that the minimum age for voluntary recruitment into the national armed forces is 18 years of age or older. No boy or girl under 18 years of age may be recruited or be allowed to be recruited, even on a voluntary basis, or be enrolled as a member of the national armed forces.

The Government of Mali is fully committed to this declaration and pledges to impose on anyone who violates such provision a penalty commensurate with the seriousness of the offence as provided for under its criminal law.

Children who are unlawfully recruited into the armed forces may, depending on their individual circumstances, receive support for their economic and social rehabilitation and reintegration.

MALTA

Declaration:

"Under the Malta Armed Forces Act (Chapter 220 of the Laws of Malta), enacted in 1970, enlistment in the Armed Forces of Malta shall be made on a voluntary basis and no person under the age of seventeen years and six months may be so enlisted. A person under 18 years may not be enlisted unless consent to the enlistment is given in writing by the father of such person or, if such person is not subject to paternal authority, by the mother or by an other person in whose care the person offering to enlist may be. In any case, the term of engagement of a person enlisting under the age of 18 expires on reaching 18 years of age and enlistment has to be renewed. It is a mandatory condition for enlistment of potential recruits to produce a birth certificate from the national Civil Status Office to attest their age.

The Malta Armed Forces Act also provides that any person of whatever age offering to enlist in the regular force shall, before enlistment, be given a notice on the prescribed form stating the general conditions of engagement and the recruiting officer shall not enlist any person in the regular force unless satisfied that the potential recruit has been given such notice, understood its contents and wishes to be enlisted.

In practice the Armed Forces of Malta do not recruit and have not since 1970 recruited persons under the age of 18 years. The Government of Malta further declares that if in future recruitment of persons under 18 years were made such members of the armed forces will not take part in hostilities.

Regulations under the Malta Armed Forces Act provide for a Junior Leaders Scheme whereby persons under the age of seventeen and six months could be recruited for training but in a non-combatant position, but in effect no such recruitment has taken place since 1970."

MAURITIUS

Declaration:

"The Government of the Republic of Mauritius declares, in accordance with article 3 (2) of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict, that the minimum age for voluntary recruitment of persons into its paramilitary force is 18 years."

MEXICO

Declaration:

In accordance with article 3, paragraph 2 of the Optional Protocol, the United Mexican States declares:

(i) That the minimum age for voluntary recruitment of its nationals into the armed forces is 18 years;

ii) That article 24 of the Military Service Act provides that only volunteers will be accepted into the armed forces for active service until the figure set annually by the Ministry of Defence has been met and provided that the following conditions are fulfilled:

I. They must submit an application;

II. They must be Mexican nationals who are over 18 but not over 30, and must be under 40 in the case of personnel enlisted as specialists in the army;

Those over 16 and under 18 shall be accepted into signals units for training as technicians under contracts with the State not exceeding five years in duration. Moreover, under article 25 of the Military Service Act, only the following persons may be accepted for early enlistment in the armed forces:

I. Those who wish to leave the country at the time when they would be required by law to undertake military service if they are over 16 at the time of requesting enlistment;

II. Those who are obliged to request early enlistment because of their studies.

The maximum number of individuals who may be allowed to enlist early shall be set every year by the Ministry of Defence; and

Interpretative declaration:

In ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 25 May 2000, the Government of the United Mexican States considers that any responsibility deriving therefrom for non-governmental armed groups for the recruitment of children under 18 years or their use in hostilities lies solely with such groups and shall not be applicable to the Mexican State as such. The latter shall have a duty to apply at all times the principles governing international humanitarian law.

MONACO

Declaration:

The Principality of Monaco declares, in accordance with article 3, paragraph 2, of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, that it is bound by the Franco-Monaguesque Treaty of 17 July 1918 and that the French Republic thereby ensures the defence of the territorial integrity of the Principality of Monaco.

The only bodies having military status in the Principality are the Prince's Guard and the Fire Brigade. In accordance with the provisions of Sovereign Ordinance No. 8017 of 1 June 1984 relating to the Police Code, members of the Guard and the Fire Brigade must be at least 21 years of age.

MONGOLIA

Declaration:

"Under the relevant law of Mongolia the minimum age for recruitment into military service is 18 years. Mongolian male citizens of 18 to 25 years have the duty to fulfill a military service. Men of 18 to 25 years who have not fulfilled their military service for the reasons of their religious faith or moral belief may fulfill an alternative service for a period of 24 to 27 months with rescue or professional units or divisions of the General Department on Disaster Management, assisting forces of the Border Troops or other humanitarian organizations."

MONTENEGRO

Declaration:

"The Republic of Montenegro hereby declares that in accordance with article 3, paragraph 2, the Government of the Republic of Montenegro does not impose mandatory military service. The minimum age at which Montenegro will permit voluntary recruitment into its national armed forces shall be 18 years. This provision is already prescribed in the Bill on Defence and Bill on the Army of the Republic of Montenegro, which are currently in the procedure in the Montenegrin Government."

MOROCCO

Declaration:

Pursuant to paragraph 2 of the article concerning the involvement of children in armed conflicts, the Kingdom of Morocco declares that the minimum age required by national law for voluntary recruitment in the armed forces is 18 years.

MOZAMBIQUE

Declaration:

".....in accordance with the Mozambican legislation, the minimum age for enlistment into its national armed forces is 18 years,

The Republic of Mozambique declares, also that according to the law, the incorporation starts at the age of 20.

The Republic of Mozambique, furthermore declares that in case of war the age for the military service can be modified."

NAMIBIA

Declaration:

"Pursuant to article 3, paragraph 2, of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on Involvement of Children in Armed Conflicts, Namibia hereby declares:

1. The Namibian Defence Force permit voluntary recruitment at the minimum age of 18 years.

2. The Namibian Defence Force have adopted the following safeguards to ensure that recruitment of personnel at the age between 18 and 25 years is not forced or coerced.

(a) Advertisements on the availability of military career opportunities in the Namibian Defence Force are placed yearly in the local print and broadcast for the purposes of inviting interested young men and women to apply.

(b) As a standpoint the candidate is not obliged to accept the position if the Namibian Defence Force offer a particular position.

(c) Military career opportunities may emanate from Infantry, Engineering, Air wing, Maritime Wing, Communication and Medical Services. The potential recruits undergo instruction courses to give them an overview of what is expected of them as future soldiers in respect of military career opportunities stated under paragraph 2 c). The recruits may select their career paths after training.

(d) To ensure the absence of any possible form of remote or direct coercion the Namibian Defence Force requires that

i) the potential recruit should not have previous criminal records or convictions

ii) the potential recruits be Namibian Citizens

3. As a standpoint and policy Namibia Defence Force does not allow voluntary recruitment under the age of 18 years thus:

i) as proof of age requires that the candidates show certified copies of legally recognised Namibian identity documents as well as birth certificates.

4. All recruitments of personnel in the Namibian Defence Force are voluntary. Namibia does not practice conscription or any form of forced obligatory service."

NEPAL

Declaration:

"(1) The minimum age for recruitment in the Nepal Army and the Armed Police Force shall be 18 years.

(2) The recruitment in the Nepal Army and the Armed Police Force shall be voluntary and shall be conducted through open competition."

NEW ZEALAND

Declaration:

"The Government of New Zealand declares that the minimum age at which New Zealand will permit voluntary recruitment into its national armed forces shall be 17 years. The Government of New Zealand further declares that the safeguards which it has adopted to ensure that such recruitment is not forced or coerced include the following:

(a) Defence Force recruitment procedures requiring that persons responsible for recruitment ensure that such recruitment is genuinely voluntary;

(b) legislative requirements that the consent of parent or guardian is obtained for enlistment where such consent is necessary under NZ law. The parent or guardian must also acknowledge that the person enlisting will be liable for active service after reaching the age of 18 years;

(c) a detailed and informative enlistment process, which ensures that all persons are fully informed of the duties involved in military service prior to taking an oath of allegiance; and

(d) a recruiting procedure, which requires enlistees to produce their birth certificate as reliable proof of age."

NICARAGUA

Declaration:

In accordance with the requirements currently in force, young persons of both sexes wishing to enter the Nicaraguan armed forces must:

1. Be between 18 and 21 years of age. Young persons choosing a military career must submit a notarized authorization from their parents or guardians in order to prevent recruitment by force or coercion;
2. Be Nicaraguan nationals;
3. Be physically and mentally fit;
4. Be unmarried and without children;
5. Not be subject to criminal proceedings and not have been convicted by the country's jurisdictional bodies;
6. Consent voluntarily and freely to join the Nicaraguan army.

NORWAY

Declaration:

"Pursuant to Article 3, second paragraph, of the Protocol, the Government of the Kingdom of Norway declares that the minimum age for voluntary recruitment to the armed forces is 18 years."

OMAN

Reservation:

..... subject to the Sultanate's reservations to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Declaration:

.....the minimum legal age for enlistment in the Ministry of Defence and the Sultan's armed forces is eighteen years; that a birth certificate or a certificate of ascertainment of age from the competent governmental authorities constitutes the precautionary measure for ensuring compliance with that requirement; and that enlistment is optional, not compulsory.

PANAMA

Declaration:

The Republic of Panama, in ratifying the Protocol, declares that it has no armed forces. The Republic of Panama has a civilian security force consisting of the National Police, the National Air Service, the National Maritime Service and the Institutional Protection Service. Their legal charters define the requirements for recruitment of personnel by such institutions and stipulate that recruits must have reached the age of majority, i.e. 18 years.

PARAGUAY[7]

22 March 2006

Declaration:

... it has been decided to set the minimum age for recruitment into the Armed Forces at eighteen (18) years. The measures to be taken for recruitment shall be brought into line with the provisions of article 3, paragraph 3, of the aforementioned Optional Protocol.

PERU

Declaration:

In depositing the instrument of ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, the Government of Peru declares that, in compliance with its article 3, paragraph 2, the minimum age for voluntary recruitment into the national armed forces, under national legislation, is 18 years.

PHILIPPINES

Declaration:

"1. The minimum age for voluntary recruitment into the Armed Forces of the Philippines is 18 years, except for training purposes whose duration shall have the students/cadets/trainees attain the majority age at the completion date;

2. There is no compulsory, forced or coerced recruitment into the Armed Forces of the Philippines; and,

3. Recruitment is exclusively on a voluntary basis."

POLAND

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Poland, with the regard to article 3, paragraph 2 of the Protocol, declares that:

1. under the Polish law the minimum age in the case of obligatory recruitment of the Polish citizens into the national Armed Forces is eighteen (18) years.

2. under the Polish law the minimum age for the voluntary recruitment of the Polish citizens into the national Armed Forces is seventeen (17) years. Joining the Polish Armed Forces is really voluntary and a candidate is obliged to show a special document certifying the date of his/her birth. Moreover the consent of the person's parents or legal guardians is required before the admission to the service.

PORTUGAL

Upon signature:

Declaration:

“Concerning article 2 of the Protocol, the Portuguese Republic considering that it would have preferred the Protocol to exclude all types or recruitment of persons under the age of 18 years - whether this recruitment is voluntary or not, declares that it will apply its domestic legislation which prohibits the voluntary recruitment of persons under the age of 18 years and will deposit a binding declaration, in conformity with paragraph 2 of article 3 of the Protocol, setting forth 18 years as the minimum age for voluntary recruitment in Portugal.”

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

"The Government of Portugal declares, in accordance with article 3, paragraph 2, of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvment of Children in Armed Conflict that the minimum age for any recruitment - including voluntary - of persons into its national armed forces is 18 years. This age limit is already contained in the Portuguese domestic legisation."

QATAR

Declaration:

Pursuant to paragraph 2 of article 3 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict,

The State of Qatar declares that recruitment to its armed forces and other regular forces is voluntary and is for those who have attained the age of 18 years and that it takes account of the safeguards set forth in paragraph 3 of the same article.

In making this declaration, the State of Qatar affirms that its national legislation makes no provision for any form of compulsory or coercive recruitment.

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Declaration:

"In accordance with paragraph 2, Article 3 of the aforementioned Protocol, the Government of the Republic of Korea declares that the minimum age for voluntary recruitment into the Korean national armed forces is 18 years."

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

Declaration:

In accordance with article 3 paragraph 2 of the Protocol, the Republic of Moldova declares that the minimum age for recruitment into conscript military service in the Republic of Moldova is 18 years.

ROMANIA

Declaration:

“According to the law, military serivce is compulsory for Romanian citizens, males, who reached the age of 20, except in case of war or upon request, during peacetime, when they may be recruited after the age of 18.”

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Declaration:

The Russian Federation, pursuant to article 3, paragraph 2, of the Optional Protocol, declares that, in accordance with the legislation of the Russian Federation, citizens under the age of 18 may not be recruited for military service in the armed forces of the Russian Federation and a military service contract may not be concluded with them;

In accordance with the legislation of the Russian Federation, citizens who have reached the age of 16 are entitled to admission to professional military educational institutions. Upon enrolment in these institutions they shall acquire the status of members of the military performing compulsory military service. The legislation of the Russian Federation guarantees that such citizens shall conclude military service contracts on reaching the age of 18, but not before they have completed the first year of education in these educational institutions.

RWANDA

Declaration:

"Minimum age for voluntary recruitment:18 years.

Minimum age for entry into schools operated by or under the control of armed forces: Not applicable.

Status of pupils in these schools (are they part of the armed forces: Not applicable.

What reliable proof of age is required: birth certificate.

What do the armed forces comprise: Adult men and women."

SENEGAL

Declaration:

We hereby declare that the minimum age required for regular conscription and for entry into the schools for officers and sub-officers is twenty (20) years.

Candidates shall enlist in an individual capacity and shall sign enlistment and re-enlistment contracts freely and in person.

SERBIA

Declaration:

"Pursuant to article 3(2) of the Protocol, I have the honour to inform that the provisions of articles 291 and 301 of the Law on the Yugoslav Army specified that a person of military age who has turned eighteen may be recruited into the Army of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in that calendar year. The person of military age may only exceptionally be recruited in the calendar year in which he turns seventeen, at his own request, or during a state of war by order of the President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

In the light of the fact that, under the Law, only persons who have done their military service or have undergone the required military training may be called up, the minimum age for voluntary recruitment in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has been set at eighteen. Safeguards that recruitment of underage persons will not be forced or coerced are provided in the Penal Code of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and those of its constituent republics, relating to the criminal act against civil rights and liberties and dereliction of duty."

SIERRA LEONE

Declaration:

"With regard to article 3, paragraph 2, of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the participation of Children in Armed Conflict, the Government of the Republic of Sierra Leone declares that:

1. The minimum age for voluntary recruitment into the Armed Forces is 18 years;
2. There is no compulsory, forced or coerced recruitment into the National Armed Forces;
3. Recruitment is exclusively on a voluntary basis."

SINGAPORE

Declaration

"Pursuant to Article 3, Paragraph 2 of the Optional Protocol, the Republic of Singapore declares that:

1. The minimum age at which persons may be voluntarily recruited or enlisted into the Singapore Armed Forces is 16 years and 6 months; and
2. The Republic of Singapore maintains the following safeguards in respect of voluntary recruitment or enlistment of persons below the age of 18 years into the Singapore Armed Forces -

a. The person is required to produce documentary proof of age, including an authentic birth certificate and identity card;

b. Written consent of a parent or legal guardian of the person is required; and

c. The person is fully informed of the duties involved in military service by the Singapore Armed Forces through, among other things, informational brochures and career counselors to explain the demands of military life."

SLOVAKIA

Declaration:

".....the Slovak Republic declares that according to its legislation, the minimum age at which voluntary recruitment into its national armed forces is permitted, is regulated by

Act No. 570/2005 on the Conscription Obligation and on Amendment of certain Acts section 6, which stipulates that a person can voluntary accept the conscription obligation as of 1st January of the calendar year in which he/she reaches the age of 19 years; and

Act No. 346/2005 on the State Service of the Professional Soldiers of the Armed Forces of the Slovak Republic and on Amendment of certain Acts section 13, which stipulates reaching the age of 18 years as the requirement for admission to the state service of the professional soldier.

The fact, that the recruitment can be performed exclusively on the basis of a law in accordance with the Constitution of the Slovak Republic, is the sufficient safeguard to ensure that such recruitment is not forced or coerced."

SLOVENIA

Declaration:

"In compliance with Article 3, Paragraph 2, of the Optional Protocol, the Republic of Slovenia declares that the minimum age at which it will permit voluntary recruitment into its national armed forces is 18 years. The minimum age shall apply equally to men and women. By phasing out the recruitment system and introducing professional military service, the contractual reserve forces and service in the national armed forces shall be voluntary and regulated by a contract between the two parties."

SPAIN

Declaration:

For the purposes of the provisions of article 3 of the Protocol, Spain declares that the minimum age for voluntary recruitment into its armed forces is 18 years.

SRI LANKA

Declaration:

"The Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka [...] declares in accordance with article 3 (2) of [the Protocol] that under the laws of Sri Lanka:

(a) there is no compulsory, forced or coerced recruitment into the national armed forces;

(b) recruitment is solely on a voluntary basis;

(c) the minimum age for voluntary recruitment into national armed forces is 18 years."

SUDAN

Declaration:

... pursuant to article 3 (2) of the Optional Protocol, the Government of the Republic of the Sudan declares that the Republic of the Sudan is committed to maintain the minimum age for voluntary service in the Sudan armed forces at 18, and to maintain the prohibition of forced or voluntary conscription of any person under the age of 18 years.

SWEDEN

Declaration:

"... in accordance with Article 3 paragraph 2 of the Optional Protocol, [...] the minimum age required for voluntary recruitment into the Swedish National Armed Forces is eighteen (18) years."

SWITZERLAND

Declaration:

The Swiss Government declares, in accordance with article 3, paragraph 2, of the Optional Protocol, that the minimum age for the recruitment of volunteers into its national armed forces is 18 years. That age is specified by the Swiss legal system.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC[8]

Declaration:

Ratification of the two Optional Protocols by the Syrian Arab Republic shall not in any event imply recognition of Israel and shall not lead to entry into any dealings with Israel in the matters governed by the provisions of the Protocols.

The Syrian Arab Republic declares that the statutes in force and the legislation applicable to the Ministry of Defence of the Syrian Arab Republic do not permit any person under 18 years of age to join the active armed forces or the reserve bodies or formations and do not permit the enlistment of any person under that age.

TAJIKISTAN

Declaration:

On behalf of the Republic of Tajikistan, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has the honor to declare that, in accordance with [paragraph] 2 of article 3 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of a Child with respect to participation of children in military conflicts, the voluntarily recruitment of those under age of 18 to the armed forces of the Republic of Tajikistan shall be prohibited.

THAILAND

Declarations:

"1. Military service is compulsory by law. Thai men reaching the age of 18 have a duty to register on the inactive military personnel list. At the age of 21, selected inactive military personnel will become active military personnel. Inactive military personnel may also voluntarily apply to become active military personnel to serve in the national armed forces. Women are exempt from compulsory military service both in times of peace and in times of war, but are subjected to other duties assigned by law.

2. In times of war or national crisis, inactive military personnel (men aged over 18) may be recruited to participate in the armed forces.

3. Admittances to military schools such as Army Non-commissioned Officer School, Air technical Training School, Navy Non-Commissioned Officer School, Armed Forces Academies Preparatory School and Army, Naval, and Air Forces Academies is on a voluntary basis, depending on the success in the entrance examinations and subject to the consent of parents or legal guardians.

4. High school and university students regardless of gender may voluntarily apply to receive military training from the Army Reserve Command, with the consent of parents or legal guardians, without any exception. Students who complete 3 years' training are exempt from military service (as active military personnel) when they reach the age of 21.

5. Non-governmental militias are prohibited by law, regardless of the age of persons concerned."

THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Declaration:

"Related to Article 3, paragraph 2 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflicts the Republic of Macedonia states that under the Macedonian legislation there are no possibilities, neither on obligatory or voluntary grounds, to direct any person younger than 18 years of age to military service, i.e. there is no opportunity to violate the right to a special protection of persons of less than 18 years of age. In order to ensure that persons under 18 do not join its Armed Forces, the Republic of Macedonia has made the following provision:

Article 62 of the Law on Defense of the Republic of Macedonia sets forth that draftees shall be directed to military service after attaining 19 years of age. The draftee who requests to be drafted for military service shall be directed to military service after three months from the day of submission of the application, if he/she has attained 18 years of age."

TIMOR-LESTE

Declaration:

"Pursuant to Article 3, paragraph 2 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed conflicts the Government of Timor-Leste declares, that the minimum age for voluntary recruitment into its national armed forces is 18 years, as specified by the domestic law of Timor-Leste."

TOGO

Declaration:

In accordance with article 3 (2) of the Optional Protocol, the Government of the Republic of Togo:

(i) Declares that the minimum age at which voluntary recruitment into its national armed forces is permitted is eighteen (18) years;

(ii) The following is a description of the safeguards that the Government has adopted to
ensure that such recruitment is not forced or coerced:

Any person under 18 years of age cannot be recruited, neither accepted for recruitment, even voluntarily, nor registered as a member of the Togolese Armed Forces (FAT).

National military service does not exist in Togo.

The recruitment is national, voluntary, conducted in public upon presentation of a birth certificate, a school or training certificate and of diplomas obtained.

All recruits undergo a rigorous medical examination.

TUNISIA

Declaration:

In accordance with article 3, paragraph 2, of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, the Republic of Tunisia declares the following:

Under Tunisian law, the minimum age for voluntary recruitment of Tunisian citizens into the armed forces is 18 years.

In accordance with article 1 of Act No. 51-1989 of 14 March 1989 on military service, "all citizens aged 20 shall perform national service in person, except in the case of a medically certified impediment.

However, citizens may, at their request, and with the consent of their legal guardian, perform military service at the age of 18 years, subject to the approval of the Secretary General of the Ministry of Defence."

In accordance with article 27 of Act No. 51-1989 of 14 March 1989 on military service, "any citizen between the ages of 18 and 23 may be admitted into military schools subject to such conditions as may be determined by the Secretary General of the Ministry of Defence.

Young people who have not attained the age of majority must first get the consent of their legal guardian; in such case, the first year of service shall count towards the fulfilment of military service obligations and be considered as enlistment before call-up."

Articles 1 and 27 of the Act of 14 March 1989 provide legal safeguards for citizens under the age of 18 years, since acceptance into national military service or recruitment into the armed forces is on a strictly voluntary basis.

TURKEY[9]

Declarations:

"1. The Republic of Turkey declares, in accordance with Article 3 (2) of the Optional Protocol, that military service is compulsory in Turkey, however Turkish citizens are not subjected to compulsory military service before reaching the legal age of maturity. In accordance with the Turkish Military Code, military service begins on 1st January of the twentieth age; in cases of mobilisation and state of emergency, individuals who are liable to military service may be recruited at the age of 19.

There is no voluntary recruitment in Turkey.

However, Article 11 of the Military Code envisages a voluntary recruitment for navy and gendarmerie classes and non-commissioned officers at a minimum age of 18. Nevertheless, this article, which is in compliance with the age regulation of the Optional Protocol, is not applied in practice.

Students of military schools, who are exempted from the Optional Protocol according to Article 3 (5) of this protocol, are not subjected to compulsory military service. Under the Turkish legal system, such students are not considered as "soldiers" and are not held liable for "military service".

2. Admittance to the military high schools and preparatory non-commissioned officer schools is on a voluntary basis, depending on success in the entrance examinations and with the consent of parents or legal guardians. Students who have completed their primary school education and enrolled into such schools at a minimum age of 15 can quit them at any time if they so wish."

Reservations:

"The Republic of Turkey declares that it will implement the provisions of the existing Optional Protocol only to the States Parties which it recognizes and with which it has diplomatic relations.

The Republic of Turkey declares with regard to Article 3 (5) of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict that the reservation it made to Article 29 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which is referred to in the said paragraph of the Optional Protocol, fully retains its validity."

TURKMENISTAN

Declaration:

"A citizen of male sex at the age of 18 to 30 years, which has no right to discharge or deferment from conscription, is subject to a call to military service.

Decision on conscription of a citizen to a military service can be adopted after he has reached 18 years of age.

Decision to call a citizen to a military service can be adopted after achievement by him of 17 years of age after his personal application for voluntary military service."

UGANDA

Declaration:

"The Government of the Republic of Uganda declares that the minimum age for the recruitment of persons into the armed forces is by law set at eighteen (18) years. Recruitment is entirely and squarely voluntary and is carried out with the full informed consent of the persons being recruited. There is no conscription in Uganda.

The Government of the Republic of Uganda reserves the right at any time by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to add, amend or strengthen the present declaration. Such notifications shall take effect from the date of their receipt by the Secretary-General of the United Nations."

UKRAINE

Declaration:

Ukraine confirms its obligations taken under Article 38 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child in case of the armed conflicts which concern children and, referring to paragraph 2 of Article 3 of the Optional Protocol, declares hereby that the minimum age for the voluntary (on a contractual basis) joining into its national armed forces is 19 years.

Ukraine, in accordance with the provisions of its national legislation, guarantees its adherence to the exclusive principle of voluntarism in the process of recruitment of citizens into its armed forces on a contractual basis, without any manifestation of violence and enforcement.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland will take all feasible measures to ensure that members of its armed forces who have not attained the age of 18 years do not take a direct part in hostilities.

The United Kingdom understands that article 1 of the Optional Protocol would not exclude the deployment of members of its armed forces under the age of 18 to take a direct part in hostilities where: -

a) there is a genuine military need to deploy their unit or ship to an area in which hostilities are taking place; and

b) by reason of the nature and urgency of the situation:-

i) it is not practicable to withdraw such persons before deployment; or

ii) to do so would undermine the operational effectiveness of their ship or unit, and thereby put at risk the successful completion of the military mission and/or the safety of other personnel."

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

".....in accordance with Article 3, paragraph 2, of the Optional Protocol:

- The minimum age at which individuals may join the UK Armed Forces is 16 years. This minimum broadly reflects the minimum statutory school leaving age in the United Kingdom, that is the age at which young persons may first be permitted to cease full-time education and enter the full-time employment market. Parental consent is required in all cases of recruitment under the age of 18 years.

The United Kingdom maintains the following safeguards in respect of voluntary recruitment into the armed forces:

1. The United Kingdom Armed Forces are manned solely by volunteers; there is no compulsory recruitment.
2. A declaration of age, backed by an authoritative, objective proof (typically the production of an authentic birth certificate) is an integral and early requirement in the recruitment process. Should an individual volunteering to enter the United Kingdom Armed Forces be found either by their own dration or by inspection of supporting evidence of age to be under 18 years of age, special procedures are adopted. These procedures include:

- the involvement of the parent(s) or legal guardian(s) of the potential recruits:
- clear and precise explanation of the nature of duties involved in military service to the both the individual and their parent(s)/guardian(s); and
- as well as explaining the demands of military life to the individual volunteer and establishing that he/she remains a genuine volunteer, the requirement that the parent(s) or guardian(s), having been similarly informed, freely consent to the individual's entry into the Armed Forces and duly countersign the appropriate application or other appropriate recruitment process forms.

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

Declaration:

"The minimum age for the voluntary recruitment into armed conflict is eighteen years."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Declaration:

"The Government of the United States of America declares, pursuant to Article 3 (2) of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict that -

(A) the minimum age at which the United States permits voluntary recruitment into the Armed Forces of the United States is 17 years of age;

(B) The United States has established safeguards to ensure that such recruitment is not forced or coerced, including a requirement in section 505 (a) of title 10, United States Code, that no person under 18 years of age may be originally enlisted in the Armed Forces of the United States without the written consent of the person's parent or guardian, if the parent or guardian is entitled to the person's custody and control;

(C) each person recruited into the Armed Forces of the United States receives a comprehensive briefing and must sign an enlistment contract that, taken together, specify the duties involved in military service; and

(D) all persons recruited into the Armed Forces of the United States must provide reliable proof of age before their entry into military service."

Understandings:

(1) NO ASSUMPTION OF OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD.-The United States understands that the United States assumes no obligations under the Convention on the Rights of the Child by becoming a party to the Protocol.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION OF OBLIGATION NOT TO PERMIT CHILDREN TO TAKE DIRECT PART IN HOSTILITIES.-The United States understands that, with respect to Article 1 of the Protocol -

(A) the term "feasible measures" means those measures that are practical or practically possible, taking into account all the circumstances ruling at the time, including humanitarian and military considerations;

(B) the phrase "direct part in hostilities"-

(i) means immediate and actual action on the battlefield likely to cause harm to the enemy because there is a direct causal relationship between the activity engaged in and the harm done to the enemy; and

(ii) does not mean indirect participation in hostilities, such as gathering and transmitting military information, transporting weapons, munitions, or other supplies, or forward deployment; and

(C) any decision by any military commander, military personnel, or other person responsible for planning, authorizing, or executing military action, including the assignment of military personnel, shall only be judged on the basis of all the relevant circumstances and on the basis of that person's assessment of the information reasonably available to the person at the time the person planned, authorized, or executed the action under review, and shall not be judged on the basis of information that comes to light after the action under review was taken.

(3) MINIMUM AGE FOR VOLUNTARY RECRUITMENT.- The United States understands that Article 3 of the Protocol obligates States Parties to the Protocol to raise the minimum age for voluntary recruitment into their national armed forces from the current international standard of 15 years of age.

(4) ARMED GROUPS.- The United States understands that the term "armed groups" in Article 4 of the Protocol means nongovernmental armed groups such as rebel groups, dissident armed forces, and other insurgent groups.

(5) NO BASIS FOR JURISDICTION BY ANY INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL.- The United States understands that nothing in the Protocol establishes a basis for jurisdiction by any international tribunal, including the International Criminal Court."

URUGUAY

Declaration:

In fulfilment of the obligation laid down in article 3, paragraph 2 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, the Government of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay, in line with the reservation made at the time of depositing the instrument of ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, declares:

That in exercise of its sovereignty and in accordance with domestic law, it does not under any circumstances permit voluntary recruitment into the armed forces of persons under 18 years of age.

UZBEKISTAN

Declaration:

“To paragraph 2 of article 3 of the Optional Protocol : the Republic of Uzbekistan declares that, according to the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On general military duty and military service” adopted on 12 December 2002 enrollment of citizens to the Armed Forces of the Republic of Uzbekistan shall be allowed only after attainment by them of eighteen years of age.”

VANUATU

Declaration:

"... the Government of the Republic of Vanuatu pursuant to Article 3 (2) of the Protocol hereby declares that the minimum age at which it will permit voluntary recruitment into its national Armed Forces is 18 years of age as provided under Section 3 (2) of the Police Rules.

Further declaration is made that Vanuatu has adopted the following safeguards to ensure that recruitment of personnel is not forced or coerced:

A Candidate for appointment to the Force shall:

a) have reached the age of 18 years and shall not be over the age of 30 years

b) be certified by a Government medical officer to be in good health, of sound constitution and fitted both physically and mentally to perform the duties on which he will be employed after appointment;

c) have a minimum height of 1.70 meters (5 feet 8 inches);

d) have a minimum education certificate of a Senior Primary Certificate on a Certificate d'Études Primaire or pass a Police Entrance Examination;

e) be of good moral character."

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Declaration:

[The minimum age for conscription and voluntary enlistment into the national armed forces of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela is between 18 and 50 years, in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution and laws of the Republic.

The safeguards adopted by the Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela to ensure that such recruitment is not forced or coerced are as follows:

1. Article 134 of the Constitution of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela provides:

"Everyone, in accordance with the law, has the duty to provide the necessary civilian or military services for the defence, preservation and development of the country, or to deal with situations of public emergency. No one may be subjected to forced recruitment."

2. When a person has been subjected to forced recruitment, article 27, first paragraph of the Constitution of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela provides that: "everyone has the right to be protected by the courts in the enjoyment and exercise of all constitutional rights and guarantees, including those inherent personal rights which are not expressly laid down in this Constitution or in the international human rights instruments".

3. The Constitution also provides, in article 31, first paragraph, that "everyone has the right, under the provisions laid down in the human rights treaties, covenants and conventions ratified by the Republic, to send petitions or complaints to the international organs created for these purposes, in order to seek protection of human rights".

4. Furthermore, article 4 of the Military Conscription and Enlistment Act provides that military age is the period during which Venezuelans have military obligations and are between 18 and 50 years of age. No Venezuelan under the age of 18 has military obligations or the duty to register for military service.

VIET NAM

Declaration:

"To defend the Homeland is the sacred duty and right of all citizens. Citizens have the obligation to fulfil military service and participate in building the all-people national defense.

Under the law of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, only male citizens at the age of 18 and over shall be recruited in the military service. Those who are under the age of 18 shall not be directly involved in military battles unless there is an urgent need for safeguarding national independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity.

Male citizens up to the age of 17 who wish to make a long-term service in the army may be admitted to military schools. Voluntary recruitment to military schools shall be ensured by measures which, inter alia, include:

- The Law on Military Duty and other regulations on the recruitment to military schools are widely disseminated through mass media;
- Those who wish to study at a military school shall, on the voluntary basis, file their application, participate in and pass competitive examinations; they shall submit their birth certificates provided by the local authority, their education records, secondary education diploma; they shall also undergo health check in order to ensure that they are physically qualified to study and serve the military."

YEMEN

Declaration:

In accordance with article 3, paragraph 2, of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, the Government of the Republic of Yemen declares its commitment to retaining 18 years as the minimum age for voluntary recruitment into the Yemeni armed forces, as well as to retaining the ban on the compulsory or voluntary recruitment of any person under 18 years of age.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declaraitons and reservations were made upon ratification or accession.)

CYPRUS

1 July 2008

With regard to the declaration made by Turkey upon ratification:

“The Government of the Republic of Cyprus has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Republic of Turkey to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict, (New York, 25 May 2000), on 4 May 2004, in respect of the implementation of the provisions of the Optional Protocol only to the States Parties which it recognizes and with which it has diplomatic relations.

In the view of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus, this declaration amounts to a reservation. This reservation creates uncertainty as to the States Parties in respect of which Turkey is undertaking the obligations in the Protocol and raises doubt as to the commitment of Turkey to the object and purpose of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and of the said Protocol. The Government of the Republic of Cyprus therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Turkey to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict.

This reservation or the objection to it shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention on the Rights of the Child or the future entry into force of the said Protocol between the Republic of Cyprus and the Republic of Turkey.”

FINLAND

15 November 2005

With regard to the reservation made by Oman upon accession:

"The Government of Finland has carefully examined the reservations made by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict. The Government of Finland notes that the provisions of the Optional Protocol shall, according to the Government of the Sultanate of Oman, be subject to reservations concerning Islamic and domestic law.

The Government of Finland notes that a reservation which consists of a general reference to religious or other national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define to other Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Convention and creates serious doubts as to the commitment of the receiving State to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. Such reservations are, furthermore, subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations made by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman to the Protocol. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Protocol between the Sultanate of Oman and Finland. The Protocol will thus become operative between the two states without the Sultanate of Oman benefiting from its reservations."

GERMANY

17 November 2005

With regard to the reservation made by Oman upon accession:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the reservation made by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict.

The reservation refers to all the provisions of the instrument that do not accord with Islamic law or the legislation in force in the Sultanate of Oman.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that the aforesaid restrictions make it unclear to which extent the Sultanate of Oman considers itself bound by the obligations from the Optional Protocol and that this gives rise to serious doubts as to the commitment of the Sultanate of Oman to the object and purpose thereof. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the reservation made by the Sultanate of Oman to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Optional Protocol between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Sultanate of Oman."

NORWAY

2 December 2005

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

".....Norway has examined the second and third reservations made by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman on 17 September 2004 on accession to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict (New York, 25 May 2000) which concern Islamic and domestic law and limits imposed by the material resources available.

The Government of Norway is of the view that these general reservations raise doubts as to the full commitment of the Sultanate of Oman to the object and purpose of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict and would like to recall that according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Norway therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict. This objection does not preclude the entry into force, in its entirety, of the Convention between Norway and the Sultanate of Oman, without the latter benefiting from these reservations."

POLAND

1 December 2005

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

"The Government of the Republic of Poland [has] examined the reservation made by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman upon accession to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child as regards the participation of children in armed conflicts, which confirms that the reservations made to the Convention are currently valid. The above mentioned reservations refer in general to all the provisions of the Convention which are not in accordance with Islamic Law of the legislation of the Sultanate of Oman and stipulate that the provisions of the Convention should be applied within the limits imposed by the materials resources available.

The Government of the Republic of Poland considers that reservations do not specify the extent to which the Sultanate of Oman has accepted the obligations of the Convention are contrary to the object and purpose of the Protocol, i.e., to guarantee better protection of the rights of the child set forth in the Convention. The Government of the Republic of Poland would like to note that pursuant to article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, any reservations contrary to the scope and purpose of the treaty are unacceptable.

The Government of Poland therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman to the Optional Protocol.

However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Optional Protocol between the Republic of Poland and the Sultanate of Oman."

SPAIN

2 December 2005

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has examined the reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman on 17 September 2004 upon its accession to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict of 25 May 2004.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain notes that the Optional Protocol is subject to the reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The reservations to the Convention include a general reservation to all those provisions of the Convention that do not accord with Islamic Law or the legislation in force in the Oman and a reservation to the effect that the provisions of the Convention should be applied within the limits imposed by the material resources available.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that the above mentioned reservations which subordinate all the provisions of the Optional Protocol to Islamic Law or the legislation in force in Oman, to which a reference of general nature is made, without either specifying its content or the limits imposed by the material resources available, do not permit to clearly determine the extent to which Oman has accepted the obligations derived from the Optional Protocol, and thereby such reservations raise doubts as to the Sultanate of Oman's commitment to the object and purpose of the Optional Protocol.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that the reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of Children in Armed Conflict are incompatible with the object and the purpose of the Optional Protocol.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain recalls that in accordance with customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations which are incompatible with the object and the purpose of a treaty are not permitted.

Consequently, the Government of the Kingdom of Spain objects to the reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of Children in Armed Conflict.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict of 25 May 2000 between the Kingdom of Spain and the Sultanate of Oman.

SWEDEN

5 October 2005

With regard to the reservation made by Oman upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the Oman reservation to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict.

The Government of Sweden notes that the Optional Protocol is made subject to the reservation formulated by the Government of Oman concerning the Convention of Rights of the Child. The reservation to the Convention contains a general reservation to all the provisions of the Convention that do not accord with Islamic law or the legislation in force in Oman. It also contains a general limitation of the application of the Convention, which stipulates that the provisions of the Convention should be applied within the limits imposed by the material resources available.

The Government of Sweden is of the view that the reservations which do not clearly specify the extent of Oman's derogation from the provisions in question raises serious doubts as to the commitment of Oman to the object and purpose of the Optional Protocol. The Government of Sweden wishes to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Oman to the Optional Protocol to the Convention of the Rights of the Child in Armed Conflicts and considers the reservation null and void. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Optional Protocol between Oman and Sweden. The Optional Protocol enters into force in its entirety between Oman and Sweden, without Oman benefiting from its reservation."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

17 August 2005

With regard to the reservation made by Oman upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom have examined the second and third reservations made by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict (New York, 25 May 2000) on 17 September 2004 in respect of Islamic and domestic law and of limits imposed by the material resources available.

The Government of the United Kingdom consider that Oman's reservations do not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Oman.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Oman. "

Notes:

[1] For the Kingdom of Belgium. Further, on 23 June 2003, the Government of Belgium informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its declaration made upon signature. The declaration reads as follows:

This signature is equally binding on the French community, the Flemish community and the German-speaking community.

[2] With the following territorial exclusion:

"... consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand to the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, this acceptance shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory."

[3] In a communication received on 20 February 2008, the Government of China informed the Secretary-General of the following:

In accordance with provisions of article 153 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, and of article 138 of the Basic Law of the Macao Special Administrative Region, the Government of the People's Republic of China decides that the ratification shall apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

[4] With a territorial exclusion with respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland. Further, on 23 January 2004, the Government of Denmark informed the Secretatry-General that it had decided to withdraw its territorial exclusion with regard to the Faroe Islands and Greenland made upon ratification. See also note 1 under "Denmark" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] On 13 November 2008, the Government of the Republic of Chile informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to amend the declaration made upon ratification to the Protocol which reads as follows:

"The Government of Chile states that, in accordance with its domestic law, the minimum age for the voluntary recruitment of persons into its national armed forces is 17 or 18 years, and on an exceptional basis persons who have attained 16 years of age and meet certain criteria may participate in such programmes for shorter periods with the prior approval of the Director-General of the General Directorate for National Mobilization of the Ministry of National Defence and with the due consent of the parents or legal guardians."

[7] Upon ratification, the Governement of Paraguay made the following declaration: .... in accordance with the relevant national and international legal norms, it has been decided to establish the age of sixteen (16) years as the minimum age for voluntary recruitment into the armed forces. Moreover, the measures adopted to permit voluntary recruitment will be in conformity with the principles laid down in article 3, paragraph 3 of the Optional Protocol.

In a communication received on 22 March 2006, the Government of Paraguay informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to replace the original declaration made upon ratification. The declaration took effect for Paraguay on 22 March 2006, i.e. the date of its receipt.

[8] With regard to the declaration formulated by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession, the Secretary-General received on 18 July 2005, the following communication from the Government of Israel:

"The Government of the State of Israel has noted that the instrument of ratification of the Syrian Arab Republic of the above-mentioned Protocol [...], contains a declaration with respect to the State of Israel.

The Government of the State of Israel considers that such declaration, which is explicitly of a political nature, is incompatible with the purposes and objectives of the Protocol.

The Government of the State of Israel therefore objects to the aforesaid declaration made by the Syrian Arab Republic."

[9] On 29 July 2004, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Cyprus, the following communication with regard to the declarations made by Turkey upon ratification:

"The Government of the Republic of Cyprus has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Republic of Turkey to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict, (New York, 25 May 2000), on 4 May 2004, in respect of the implementation of the provisions of the Optional Protocol only to the States Parties which it recognizes and with which it has diplomatic relations.

In the view of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus, this declaration amounts to a reservation. This reservation creates uncertainty as to the States Parties in respect of which Turkey is undertaking the obligations in the Protocol and raises doubt as to the commitment of Turkey to the object and purpose of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and of the said Protocol. The Government of the Republic of Cyprus therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Turkey to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict.

This reservation or the objection to it shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention on the Rights of the Child or the future entry into force of the said Protocol between the Republic of Cyprus and the Republic of Turkey."

11. c) Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography

New York, 25 May 2000

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	18 January 2002, in accordance with article 14(1).
REGISTRATION:	18 January 2002, No. 27531.
STATUS:	Signatories: 116. Parties: 131.
TEXT:	Doc. A/RES/54/263; C.N.1032.2000.TREATIES-72 of 14 November 2000 [rectification of the the original of the Protocol (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish authentic texts)]; C.N.1008.2002.TREATIES-42 of 17 September 2002 (proposal of corrections to the original chinese text) and C.N.1312.2002.TREATIES-49 of 16 December 2002 [rectification of the original of the Protocol (Chinese authentic text)].

Note: The Optional Protocol was adopted by resolution A/RES/54/263 of 25 May 2000 at the fifty-fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. In accordance with its article 13 (1), the Optional Protocol will be open for signature by any State that is a party to the Convention or has signed it.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Afghanistan		19 Sep 2002 a
Albania		5 Feb 2008 a
Algeria		27 Dec 2006 a
Andorra	7 Sep 2000	30 Apr 2001
Angola		24 Mar 2005 a
Antigua and Barbuda	18 Dec 2001	30 Apr 2002
Argentina	1 Apr 2002	25 Sep 2003
Armenia	24 Sep 2003	30 Jun 2005
Australia	18 Dec 2001	8 Jan 2007
Austria	6 Sep 2000	6 May 2004
Azerbaijan	8 Sep 2000	3 Jul 2002
Bahrain		21 Sep 2004 a
Bangladesh	6 Sep 2000	6 Sep 2000
Belarus		23 Jan 2002 a
Belgium[1]	6 Sep 2000	17 Mar 2006
Belize	6 Sep 2000	1 Dec 2003
Benin	22 Feb 2001	31 Jan 2005
Bhutan	15 Sep 2005	
Bolivia	10 Nov 2001	3 Jun 2003
Bosnia and Herzegovina	7 Sep 2000	4 Sep 2002
Botswana		24 Sep 2003 a
Brazil	6 Sep 2000	27 Jan 2004
Brunei Darussalam		21 Nov 2006 a
Bulgaria	8 Jun 2001	12 Feb 2002
Burkina Faso	16 Nov 2001	31 Mar 2006
Burundi		6 Nov 2007 a
Cambodia	27 Jun 2000	30 May 2002
Cameroon	5 Oct 2001	
Canada	10 Nov 2001	14 Sep 2005
Cape Verde		10 May 2002 a
Chad	3 May 2002	28 Aug 2002
Chile	28 Jun 2000	6 Feb 2003
China[2]	6 Sep 2000	3 Dec 2002
Colombia	6 Sep 2000	11 Nov 2003
Comoros		23 Feb 2007 a
Costa Rica	7 Sep 2000	9 Apr 2002
Croatia	8 May 2002	13 May 2002
Cuba	13 Oct 2000	25 Sep 2001
Cyprus	8 Feb 2001	6 Apr 2006
Czech Republic	26 Jan 2005	
Democratic Republic of the Congo		11 Nov 2001 a
Denmark[3]	7 Sep 2000	24 Jul 2003
Djibouti	14 Jun 2006	
Dominica		20 Sep 2002 a
Dominican Republic		6 Dec 2006 a
Ecuador	6 Sep 2000	30 Jan 2004
Egypt		12 Jul 2002 a
El Salvador	13 Sep 2002	17 May 2004
Equatorial Guinea		7 Feb 2003 a
Eritrea		16 Feb 2005 a
Estonia	24 Sep 2003	3 Aug 2004
Fiji	16 Sep 2005	
Finland	7 Sep 2000	
France	6 Sep 2000	5 Feb 2003
Gabon	8 Sep 2000	1 Oct 2007
Gambia	21 Dec 2000	
Georgia		28 Jun 2005 a
Germany	6 Sep 2000	
Ghana	24 Sep 2003	
Greece	7 Sep 2000	22 Feb 2008

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Guatemala	7 Sep 2000	9 May 2002
Guinea-Bissau	8 Sep 2000	
Haiti	15 Aug 2002	
Holy See	10 Oct 2000	24 Oct 2001
Honduras		8 May 2002 a
Hungary	11 Mar 2002	
Iceland	7 Sep 2000	9 Jul 2001
India	15 Nov 2004	16 Aug 2005
Indonesia	24 Sep 2001	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		26 Sep 2007 a
Iraq		24 Jun 2008 a
Ireland	7 Sep 2000	
Israel	14 Nov 2001	23 Jul 2008
Italy	6 Sep 2000	9 May 2002
Jamaica	8 Sep 2000	
Japan	10 May 2002	24 Jan 2005
Jordan	6 Sep 2000	4 Dec 2006
Kazakhstan	6 Sep 2000	24 Aug 2001
Kenya	8 Sep 2000	
Kuwait		26 Aug 2004 a
Kyrgyzstan		12 Feb 2003 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		20 Sep 2006 a
Latvia	1 Feb 2002	22 Feb 2006
Lebanon	10 Oct 2001	8 Nov 2004
Lesotho	6 Sep 2000	24 Sep 2003
Liberia	22 Sep 2004	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		18 Jun 2004 a
Liechtenstein	8 Sep 2000	
Lithuania		5 Aug 2004 a
Luxembourg	8 Sep 2000	
Madagascar	7 Sep 2000	22 Sep 2004
Malawi	7 Sep 2000	
Maldives	10 May 2002	10 May 2002
Mali		16 May 2002 a
Malta	7 Sep 2000	
Mauritania		23 Apr 2007 a
Mauritius	11 Nov 2001	
Mexico	7 Sep 2000	15 Mar 2002
Micronesia (Federated States of)	8 May 2002	
Monaco	26 Jun 2000	24 Sep 2008
Mongolia	12 Nov 2001	27 Jun 2003
Montenegro[4]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	8 Sep 2000	2 Oct 2001
Mozambique		6 Mar 2003 a
Namibia	8 Sep 2000	16 Apr 2002
Nauru	8 Sep 2000	
Nepal	8 Sep 2000	20 Jan 2006
Netherlands[5]	7 Sep 2000	23 Aug 2005
New Zealand[6]	7 Sep 2000	
Nicaragua		2 Dec 2004 a
Niger	27 Mar 2002	26 Oct 2004
Nigeria	8 Sep 2000	
Norway	13 Jun 2000	2 Oct 2001
Oman		17 Sep 2004 a
Pakistan	26 Sep 2001	
Panama	31 Oct 2000	9 Feb 2001
Paraguay	13 Sep 2000	18 Aug 2003
Peru	1 Nov 2000	8 May 2002
Philippines	8 Sep 2000	28 May 2002
Poland	13 Feb 2002	4 Feb 2005
Portugal	6 Sep 2000	16 May 2003
Qatar		14 Dec 2001 a
Republic of Korea	6 Sep 2000	24 Sep 2004
Republic of Moldova	8 Feb 2002	12 Apr 2007
Romania	6 Sep 2000	18 Oct 2001
Rwanda		14 Mar 2002 a
San Marino	5 Jun 2000	
Senegal	8 Sep 2000	5 Nov 2003
Serbia	8 Oct 2001	10 Oct 2002
Seychelles	23 Jan 2001	
Sierra Leone	8 Sep 2000	17 Sep 2001
Slovakia	30 Nov 2001	25 Jun 2004
Slovenia	8 Sep 2000	23 Sep 2004
South Africa		30 Jun 2003 a
Spain	6 Sep 2000	18 Dec 2001
Sri Lanka	8 May 2002	22 Sep 2006
St. Vincent and the Grenadines		15 Sep 2005 a
Sudan		2 Nov 2004 a
Suriname	10 May 2002	
Sweden	8 Sep 2000	19 Jan 2007
Switzerland	7 Sep 2000	19 Sep 2006
Syrian Arab Republic		15 May 2003 a
Tajikistan		5 Aug 2002 a

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Thailand		11 Jan 2006 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	17 Jul 2001	17 Oct 2003
Timor-Leste		16 Apr 2003 a
Togo	15 Nov 2001	2 Jul 2004
Tunisia	22 Apr 2002	13 Sep 2002
Turkey	8 Sep 2000	19 Aug 2002
Turkmenistan		28 Mar 2005 a
Uganda		30 Nov 2001 a
Ukraine	7 Sep 2000	3 Jul 2003
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	7 Sep 2000	20 Feb 2009
United Republic of Tanzania		24 Apr 2003 a
United States of America	5 Jul 2000	23 Dec 2002
Uruguay	7 Sep 2000	3 Jul 2003
Uzbekistan		23 Dec 2008 a
Vanuatu	16 Sep 2005	17 May 2007
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	7 Sep 2000	8 May 2002
Viet Nam	8 Sep 2000	20 Dec 2001
Yemen		15 Dec 2004 a
Zambia	29 Sep 2008	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ARGENTINA

Declaration:

With reference to article 2, the Argentine Republic would prefer a broader definition of sale of children, as set out in the Inter-American Convention on International Traffic in Minors which Argentina has ratified and which, in its article 2, expressly defines traffic as the abduction, removal or retention, or attempted abduction, removal or retention, of a minor for unlawful purposes or by unlawful means. Therefore, under article 41 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, this meaning shall continue to apply. For the same reasons, the Argentine Republic believes that the sale of children should be criminalized in all cases and not only in those enumerated in article 3, paragraph 1 (a).

Concerning article 3, the Argentine Republic further states that it has not signed international instruments on the international adoption of minors, has entered a reservation in respect of subparagraphs (b), (c), (d) and (e) of article 21 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child dealing with international adoption, and does not permit international adoption of children domiciled or resident in its jurisdiction.

Concerning article 7, the Argentine Republic construes the term 'confiscation' (confiscación) to mean the seizure of goods and proceeds as part of a sentence or penalty (decomisar).*

**Translator's note: The meaning of the Spanish term "decomisar" is not as broad as the English "seizure". "Decomisar" means "seizure" during the sentencing or penalty phase only. (Seizure as a preventive measure is rendered with "incautación".)*

BELARUS

Declaration:

The Republic of Belarus, pursuant to article 3 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, declares that voluntary recruitment of citizens into the armed forces of the Republic of Belarus shall occur upon the attainment by them of 18 years of age.

Admission to a military academy, to which citizens aged 17 years or over, including those who attain 17 years of age during the year in which they are admitted to such an academy, are entitled, in accordance with article 43 of the Act of the Republic of Belarus of 5 November 1992 on Military Obligations and Military Service, shall constitute an exception to the above. Such admission shall not be forced or coerced.

The legislation of the Republic of Belarus guarantees that entry into military service as a cadet at a military academy:

Shall be voluntary;

Shall occur with the informed consent of the person's parents or legal guardians;

Shall occur on condition that such persons are fully informed of the duties involved in military service;

Shall be permitted on condition that such persons provide reliable proof of age prior to acceptance into military service.

BELGIUM[1]

Upon signature:

Declaration:

This signature is equally binding on the French community, the Flemish community and the German-speaking community.

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

The expression 'child pornography' is understood to mean the visual representation of a child participating in real or simulated sexual activities or the visual representation of the sexual parts of a child, when the dominant characteristic is a description for sexual purposes.

COLOMBIA

Declaration:

Concerning article 7 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, Colombia declares that, in accordance with its domestic legal system, it construes the penalty of "confiscation" (confiscación) only as seizure or forfeiture during the penalty phase.

DENMARK

Declaration:

"In connection with the deposit of Denmark's instrument of ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography Denmark declares that she interprets the words "any representation"in article 2 (c), of the Protocol to mean "any visual representation". Denmark further declares that the possession of pornographic visual representation of a person, who has completed his or her fifteenth year and who has consented to the said possession, shall not be considered covered by the binding provisions of the Protocol."

EL SALVADOR

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of El Salvador recognizes the extradition of nationals on the basis of the second and third clauses of article 28 of the Constitution, which stipulate that "Extradition will be regulated under international treaties; in cases involving Salvadorans, extradition will proceed only if the treaty in question expressly allows it and the treaty has been approved by the respective legislatures of the signatory countries. In any case, the terms of the treaty must include the principle of reciprocity and give Salvadorans all the guarantees with respect to trials and penalties that this Constitution provides. The accused will be extradited if the offence was committed in the territory of the requesting country, unless the offence is international in scope, and in no case for political offences, even though common criminal offences may have occurred as a result.".

KUWAIT

Reservation:

.....with a reservation in respect of paragraph 5 of article 3 of the second protocol.

LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Reservation:

"The Lao People's Democratic Republic [...] does not consider itself bound by Article 5 (2) of the said Optional Protocol."

OMAN

Reservation:

..... subject to the Sultanate's reservations to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

QATAR[7,8]

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Korea understands that Article 3(1)(a)(ii) of the aforementioned Protocol is applicable only to States Parties to the Convention on Protection of Children and Co-operation in Respect of Intercountry Adoption, done at The Hague on 29 May 1993.

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

Declaration:

"Until the full re-establishment of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova, the provisions of the convention shall be applied only on the territory controlled effectively by the authorities of the Republic of Moldova."

SWEDEN

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"Reference is made to earlier statements submitted by the EU in connection with the Working group's *ad-referendum* adoption of the Optional Protocol on 4 February 2000 and the national statement submitted by Sweden at the same occasion as well as the Swedish statement submitted in connection with the adoption of the Protocol by the General Assembly on 25 May 2000. Furthermore Sweden interprets the words 'any representation' in article 2 c) as 'visual representation' ".

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

".....Sweden interprets the word "any representation"in article 2 c) of the Protocol as "visual representation".

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Reservation:

"A reservation is entered to the provisions set forth in article 3, paragraph 5, and article 3, paragraph 1 (a) (ii) of the Optional Protocol on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, which relate to adoption.

Declaration:

Ratification of the two Optional Protocols by the Syrian Arab Republic shall not in any event imply recognition of Israel and shall not lead to entry into any dealings with Israel in the matters governed by the provisions of the Protocols."

TURKEY

Declaration:

"The Republic of Turkey declares that it will implement the provisions of the existing Optional Protocol only to the States Parties which it recognizes and with which it has diplomatic relations".

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Reservation:

" To the extent that the domestic law of the United States does not provide for jurisdiction over an offense described in Article 3 (1) of the Protocol if the offense is committed on board a ship or aircraft registered in the United States, the obligation with respect to jurisdiction over that offense shall not apply to the United States until such time as the United States may notify the Secretary-General of the United Nations that United States domestic law is in full conformity with the requirements of Article 4 (1) of the Protocol.

The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following understandings:

(1) NO ASSUMPTION OF OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD.-The United States understands that the United States assumes no obligations under the Convention on the Rights of the Child by becoming a party to the Protocol.

(2) THE TERM "CHILD PORNOGRAPHY". -The United States understands that the term "sale of children" as defined in Article 2(a) of the Protocol, is intended to cover any transaction in which remuneration or other consideration is given and received under circumstances in which a person who does not have a lawful right to custody of the child thereby obtains de facto control over the child.

(3) THE TERM "CHILD PORNOGRAPHY".-The United States understands the term "child pornography", as defined in Article 2(c) of the Protocol, to mean the visual representation of a child engaged in real or simulated sexual activities or of the genitalia of a child where the dominant characteristic is depiction for a sexual purpose.

(4) THE TERM "TRANSFER OF ORGANS FOR PROFIT".-The United States understands that- (A) the term "transfer of organs for profit", as used in Article 3(1)(a)(i) of the Protocol, does not cover any situation in which a child donates an organ pursuant to lawful consent; and

(B) the term "profit", as used in Article 3(1)(a)(i) of the Protocol, does not include the lawful paymeasonable amount associated with the transfer of organs, including any payment for the expense of travel, housing, lost wages, or medical costs.

(5) THE TERMS "APPLICABLE INTERNATIONAL LEGAL INSTRUMENTS" AND "IMPROPERLY INDUCING CONSENT".-

(A) UNDERSTANDING OF "APPLICABLE INTERNATIONAL LEGAL INSTRUMENTS".-The United States understands that the term "applicable international legal instruments" in Articles 3 (1) (a) (ii) and 3 (5) of the Protocol refers to the Convention on Protection of Children and Co-operation in Respect of Intercountry Adoption done at The Hague on May 29, 1993 (in this paragraph referred to as "The Hague Convention").

(B) NO OBLIGATION TO TAKE CERTAIN ACTION.-The United States is not a party to The Hague Convention, but expects to become a party. Accordingly, until such time as the United States becomes a party to The Hague Convention, it understands that it is not obligated to criminalize conduct proscribed by Article 3(1)(a)(ii) of the Protocol or to take all appropriate legal and administrative measures required by Article 3(5) of the Protocol.

(C) UNDERSTANDING Of "IMPROPERLY INDUCING CONSENT".-The United States understands that the term "Improperly inducing consent" in Article 3(1)(a)(ii) of the Protocol means knowingly and willfully inducing consent by offering or giving compensation for the relinquishment of parental rights.

(6) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROTOCOL IN THE FEDERAL SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES.-The United States understands that the Protocol shall be implemented by the Federal Government to the extent that it exercises jurisdiction over the matters covered therein, and otherwise by the State and local governments. To the extent that State and local governments exercise jurisdiction over such matters, the Federal Government shall as necessary, take appropriate measures to ensure the fulfillment of the Protocol.

VIET NAM

Reservation:

"... the Socialist Republic of Vietnam makes its reservation to article 5 (1), (2), (3), and (4) of the said Protocol."

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRIA

4 Octobre 2002

With regard to the reservation made by Qatar upon accession:

"The Government of Austria has examined the reservation to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography made by the Government of Qatar at the time of its accession to the Optional Protocol.

The Government of Austria are of the view that since this reservation refers in a general manner to the Islamic law without precising its content it leaves other state parties in doubt as to the real extent of the state of Qatar's commitment to the Optional Protocol. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose., by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative change necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

For these reasons, the Government of Austria objects to this reservation made by the Government of Qatar.

This position, however, does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Optional Protocol between Qatar and Austria."

CYPRUS

12 August 2003*

With regard to the declaration made by Turkey upon ratification:

"...The Government of the Republic of Cyprus has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Republic of Turkey upon ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography on 19 August 2002, in respect of the implementation of the provisions of the Convention only to the States Parties which it recognizes and with which it has diplomatic relations.

In the view of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus, this declaration amounts to a reservation. This reservation creates uncertainty as to the States Parties in respect of which Turkey is undertaking the obligations in the Convention and raises doubt as to the commitment of Turkey to the object and purpose of the said Optional Protocol. The Government of the Republic of Cyprus therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Turkey to the Optional Protocol to the Convention of the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography.

This reservation or the objection to it shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Cyprus and the Republic of Turkey."

* *With regard to this objection, the Government of Cyprus, upon ratification of the Optional Protocol, on 6 April 2006, stated the following:*

" The Government of the Republic of Cyprus wishes to reiterate its objection of 12th August 2003, with regard to the declaration made by Turkey upon ratification."

FRANCE

18 June 2002

With regard to the reservation made by Qatar upon accession:

The Government of the French Republic has examined the reservation entered by the Government of Qatar upon acceding to the Optional Protocol of 25 May 2000 to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, concerning the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography. While indicating that it was acceding to the Protocol and voicing, in a general manner, reservations with respect to provisions of the Protocol that it regards as violating Islamic Shariah rules, the Government of Qatar has entered a reservation of a general, indeterminate nature that leaves other States parties unable to establish which provisions of the Convention the reservation currently concerns and which provisions are likely to be concerned in the future. The Government of the French Republic believes that the reservation could deprive the provisions of the Convention of any effect and is entering an objection thereto.

18 November 2005

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

"The Government of the French Republic has examined the reservation entered by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman upon acceding, on 17 September 2004, to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, concerning the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography by which the Sultanate extends to the Protocol the reservations it entered with respect to the Convention. While indicating that it was acceding to the Protocol and voicing, in a general manner, reservations with respect to provisions of the Protocol that it regards as violating Islamic sharia rules, the Sultanate of Oman has entered a reservation of a general, indeterminate nature that leaves other States parties unable to establish which provisions of the Convention the reservation currently concerns and which provisions are likely to be concerned in the future. Theovernment of the French Republic believes that the reservation could deprive the provisions of the Convention of any effect and is entering an objection thereto. This objection shall not prevent the entry into force of the Convention between France and the Sultanate of Oman."

GERMANY

21 March 2002

With regard to the reservation made by Qatar upon accession:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has examined the reservation to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography made by the Government of Qatar at the time of its accession to the Optional Protocol. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the view that the reservation with regard to the compatibility of the rules of the Optional Protocol with the precepts of Islamic Shariah raises doubts as to the commitment of Qatar to fulfil its obligations under the Optional Protocol. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers this reservation to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Optional Protocol. Therefore the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Qatar to the Optional Protocol.

ISRAEL

30 September 2003

With regard to the declaration made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of the State of Israel has noted that the instrument of accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to the above mentioned Protocol contains a declaration with respect to the State of Israel.

The Government of the State of Israel is of the view that the declaration which is political in its nature, is incompatible with the purposes and objectives of this Protocol.

The Government of the State of Israel therefore objects to the aforesaid declaration made by the Syrian Arab Republic to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography."

On 23 July 2008, upon its ratification to the Protocol, the Government of the State of Israel reiterated his objection to the declaration made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession. The text of the objection made by the State of Israel upon ratification reads as follows:

"The Government of the State of Israel has noted that the instrument of accession of the Syrian Arab Republic of the above-mentioned Protocol which appears in the Depositary Notification Ref: C.N.679.2003.TREATIES-15 of 2 July 2003, contains a declaration with respect to the State of Israel.

The Government of the State of Israel considers that such declaration, which is explicitly of a political nature, is incompatible with the purposes and objectives of the Protocol.

The Government of the State of Israel therefore objects to the aforesaid declaration made by the Syrian Arab Republic."

NORWAY

30 December 2002

With regard to the reservation made by Qatar upon accession:

"The Government of Norway has examined the content of the reservation made by the Government of Qatar upon accession to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography.

The reservation purports to give Islamic Shariah preference over the provisions of the Optional Protocol and does not clearly define to what extent Qatar has accepted the obligations of the latter. The Government of Norway therefore objects to the reservation, as it is contrary to the object and purpose of the Optional Protocol and thus impermissible according to well-established principles of international law.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Optional Protocol between the Kingdom of Norway and Qatar. The Optional Protocol thus becomes operative between Norway and Qatar without Qatar benefiting from the reservation."

19 January 2006

With regard to the reservation made by Oman upon accession:

"The Permanent Mission of Norway to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honour to convey that Norway has examined the second and third reservations made by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman on 17 September 2004 on accession to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography (New York, 25 May 2000) which concern Islamic and domestic law and limits imposed by the material resources available.

The Government of Norway is of the view that these general reservations raise doubts as to the full commitment of the Sultanate of Oman to the object and purpose of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography and would like to recall that according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Norway therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography. This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety, of the Convention between the Kingdom of Norway and the Sultanate of Oman, without the latter benefiting from these reservations."

SPAIN

10 September 2002

With regard to the reservation made by Qatar upon accession:

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has examined the reservation made by the Government of the State of Qatar on 14 December 2001 to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, concerning any provisions in the protocol that are in conflict with the Islamic Shariah.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that this reservation, which refers in a general way to Islamic law without specifying its content, creates doubts among the other States parties about the extent to which the State of Qatar commits itself to comply with the Optional Protocol.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain is of the view that the reservation by the Government of the State of Qatar is incompatible with the object and purpose of the said Optional Protocol, since it refers to the Protocol as a whole and could seriously restrict or even exclude its application on a basis as ill-defined as the general reference to the Islamic Shariah.

Therefore, the Government of the Kingdom of Spain objects to the above-mentioned reservation by the Government of the State of Qatar to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the said Optional Protocol between the Kingdom of Spain and the State of Qatar.

SWEDEN

27 November 2002

With regard to the reservation made by Qatar upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by Qatar upon acceding to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography.

The Government of Sweden notes that the Protocol is being made subject to a general reservation of unlimited scope referring to the contents of Islamic sharia.

The Government of Sweden is of the view that this reservation which does not clearly specify the provisions of the Convention to which it applies, and the extent of the derogation therefrom, raises serious doubts as to the commitment of Qatar to the object and purpose of the Protocol. The Government of Sweden would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Qatar to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Qatar and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Qatar benefiting from its reservation."

11 July 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Turkey upon ratification:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the declaration made by Turkey upon ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography.

The declaration states that Turkey will implement the provisions of the Optional Protocol only to the States Parties which it recognises and with which it has diplomatic relations. This statement in fact amounts, in the view of the Government of Sweden, to a reservation. The reservation makes it unclear to what extent Turkey considers itself bound by the obligations of the Optional Protocol. In absence of further clarification, therefore, the reservation raises doubt as to the commitment of Turkey to the object and purpose of the Optional Protocol.

The Government of Sweden would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention of the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by Turkey to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Optional Protocol between Turkey and Sweden. The Optional Protocol enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Turkey benefiting from its reservation."

Notes:

[1] For the Kingdom of Belgium.

[2] In its instrument of ratification, the Government of China informed the Secretary-General of the following:

In accordance with the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and as suggested by the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, the application of the Protocol to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China requires prior enactment of domestic legislation by the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, and the Protocol shall not apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China until the Government of China notifies otherwise;

2. In accordance with the Basic Law of the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and as suggested by the Government of the Macao Special Administrative Region, the Protocol shall apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

[3] With a territorial exclusion in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

[4] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] For the Kingdom in Europe. On 17 October 2006: extension to Aruba.

[6] See also note 1 under “New Zealand” regarding Tokelau in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] With regard to the reservation made by Qatar upon accession, the Secretary-General received the following communication on the date indicated hereinafter:

Ireland (6 January 2003):

"The Government of Ireland have examined the reservation to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography made by the Government of Qatar at the time of its accession to the Optional Protocol.

The Government of Ireland are of the view that this reservation refers in a general manner to Islamic law without precising its content and therefore leaves other states parties in doubt as to the real extent of the state of Qatar’s commitment to the Optional Protocol. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

For these reasons, the Government of Ireland object to this reservation made by the Government of Qatar.

This position, however, does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Optional Protocol between Qatar and Ireland."

Finland (10 March 2003):

"The Government of Finland has carefully examined the contents of the reservation made by the Government of Qatar to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography.

The Government of Finland notes that the reservation made by Qatar which consists of a general reference to religious law without specifying its contents does not clearly define the extent to which Qatar commits itself to the Protocol and therefore creates serious doubts as to its commitment to fulfil its obligations under the Protocol. Such a reservation is subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party manot invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

The Government of Finland also notes that the reservation of Qatar, being of too general a nature, raises doubts as to the full commitment of Qatar to the object and purpose of the Protocol, and wishes to recall that, according to the customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of the Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of Qatar to the Protocol."

Netherlands (7 April 2003):

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservation made by the Government of Qatar at the time of its accession to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the rights of the child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservation concerning the national law of Qatar, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Protocol by invoking national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of this State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to paragraph 2 of article 28 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Qatarto the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the rights of the child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Qatar."

[8] On 18 June 2008, the State of Qatar informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the following reservation made upon accession:

... subject to a general reservation regarding any provisions in the protocol that are in conflict with the Islamic Shariah.

12. SECOND OPTIONAL PROTOCOL TO THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS, AIMING AT THE ABOLITION OF THE DEATH PENALTY

New York, 15 December 1989

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 11 July 1991, in accordance with article 8(1).
REGISTRATION: 11 July 1991, No. 14668.
STATUS: Signatories: 35. Parties: 71.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1642, p. 414.

Note: The said Protocol, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, was adopted by resolution 44/128[1] of 15 December 1989 at the Forty-fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and is open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters in New York by all States having signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Albania		17 Oct 2007 a
Andorra	5 Aug 2002	22 Sep 2006
Argentina	20 Dec 2006	2 Sep 2008
Australia		2 Oct 1990 a
Austria	8 Apr 1991	2 Mar 1993
Azerbaijan		22 Jan 1999 a
Belgium	12 Jul 1990	8 Dec 1998
Bosnia and Herzegovina	7 Sep 2000	16 Mar 2001
Bulgaria	11 Mar 1999	10 Aug 1999
Canada		25 Nov 2005 a
Cape Verde		19 May 2000 a
Chile	15 Nov 2001	26 Sep 2008
Colombia		5 Aug 1997 a
Costa Rica	14 Feb 1990	5 Jun 1998
Croatia		12 Oct 1995 a
Cyprus[2]		10 Sep 1999 a
Czech Republic		15 Jun 2004 a
Denmark	13 Feb 1990	24 Feb 1994
Djibouti		5 Nov 2002 a
Ecuador		23 Feb 1993 a
Estonia		30 Jan 2004 a
Finland	13 Feb 1990	4 Apr 1991
France		2 Oct 2007 a
Georgia		22 Mar 1999 a
Germany[3]	13 Feb 1990	18 Aug 1992
Greece		5 May 1997 a
Guinea-Bissau	12 Sep 2000	
Honduras	10 May 1990	1 Apr 2008
Hungary		24 Feb 1994 a
Iceland	30 Jan 1991	2 Apr 1991
Ireland		18 Jun 1993 a
Italy	13 Feb 1990	14 Feb 1995
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Liechtenstein		10 Dec 1998 a
Lithuania	8 Sep 2000	27 Mar 2002
Luxembourg	13 Feb 1990	12 Feb 1992
Malta[4]		29 Dec 1994 a
Mexico		26 Sep 2007 a
Monaco		28 Mar 2000 a
Montenegro[5]		23 Oct 2006 d
Mozambique		21 Jul 1993 a
Namibia		28 Nov 1994 a
Nepal		4 Mar 1998 a
Netherlands[6]	9 Aug 1990	26 Mar 1991
New Zealand[7]	22 Feb 1990	22 Feb 1990
Nicaragua	21 Feb 1990	25 Feb 2009
Norway	13 Feb 1990	5 Sep 1991
Panama		21 Jan 1993 a
Paraguay		18 Aug 2003 a
Philippines	20 Sep 2006	20 Nov 2007
Poland	21 Mar 2000	
Portugal	13 Feb 1990	17 Oct 1990
Republic of Moldova		20 Sep 2006 a
Romania	15 Mar 1990	27 Feb 1991
Rwanda		15 Dec 2008 a
San Marino	26 Sep 2003	17 Aug 2004
Sao Tome and Principe	6 Sep 2000	
Serbia		6 Sep 2001 a
Seychelles		15 Dec 1994 a
Slovakia	22 Sep 1998	22 Jun 1999
Slovenia	14 Sep 1993	10 Mar 1994

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)
South Africa		28 Aug 2002 a
Spain[8]	23 Feb 1990	11 Apr 1991
Sweden	13 Feb 1990	11 May 1990
Switzerland		16 Jun 1994 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		26 Jan 1995 a
Timor-Leste		18 Sep 2003 a
Turkey	6 Apr 2004	2 Mar 2006
Turkmenistan		11 Jan 2000 a
Ukraine		25 Jul 2007 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	31 Mar 1999	10 Dec 1999
Uruguay	13 Feb 1990	21 Jan 1993
Uzbekistan		23 Dec 2008 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	7 Jun 1990	22 Feb 1993

Declarations and Reservations (Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AZERBAIJAN[9]

Reservation:

"The Republic of Azerbaijan, adopting the [said Protocol], in exceptional cases, adopting the special law, allows the application of death penalty for the grave crimes, committed during the war or in condition of the threat of war."

28 September 2000

"It is provided for the application of the death penalty in time of war pursuant to a conviction of a person for a most serious crime of a military nature committed during wartime."

CHILE

Reservation:

The State of Chile formulates the reservation authorised under article 2, paragraph 1, of the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty, and may in consequence apply the death penalty in time of war pursuant to a conviction for a most serious crime of a military nature committed during wartime.

CYPRUS[2]

GREECE

Reservation:

Subject to article 2 for the application of the death penalty in time of war pursuant to a conviction for a most serious crime of a military nature committed during wartime.

MALTA[4]

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

Declaration:

"Until the full re-establishment of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova, the provisions of the Convention shall be applied only on the territory controlled effectively by the authorities of the Republic of Moldova. "

SPAIN[8]

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 49 (A/44/49)* , p. 206.

[2] On 20 June 2003, the Government of Cyprus informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation made upon accession to the Optional Protocol. The reservation reads as follows:

"The Republic of Cyprus in accordance with article 2.1 of the [...] Protocol reserves the right to apply the Death Penalty in time of war pursuant to a conviction of a most serious crime of a military nature committed during wartime."

[3] The German Democratic Republic signed and ratified the Protocol on 7 March 1990 and 16 August 1990, respectively. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In a communication received on 15 June 2000, the Government of Malta informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation made upon accession. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1844, p. 318

[5] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

[7] See also note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] On 13 January 1998, the Government of Spain notified the

Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation made upon ratification. The reservation reads as follows:

Pursuant to article 2, Spain reserves the right to apply the death penalty in the exceptional and extremely serious cases provided for in Fundamental Act No. 13/1985 of 9 December 1985 regulating the Military Criminal Code, in wartime as defined in article 25 of that Act.

[9] With regard to the reservation made by Azerbaijain upon accession, the Secretary-General received communications from the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

France (8 february 2000):

The Government of the French Republic has taken note of the reservation made by Azerbaijan to the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty, which was adopted on 15 December 1989. This reservation, in allowing the application of the death penalty for grave crimes committed during war or 'in condition of the threat of war', exceeds the scope of the reservations permitted under article 2, paragraph 1, of the Protocol. Under this article, only a reservation made 'at the time of ratification or accession that provides for the application of the death penalty in time of war pursuant to a conviction for a most serious crime of a military nature committed during wartime' is admissible. Consequently, the Government of the French Republic expresses its objection to this reservation, without prejudice to the entry into force of the Protocol between Azerbaijan and France.

Finland (17 March 2000):

"The Government of Finland notes that, according to Article 2 of the Second Optional Protocol, a reservation other than the kind referred to in the same Article is not acceptable. The reservation made by the Government of Azerbaijan is partly in contradiction with Article 2 as it does not limit the application of death penalty to the most serious crimes of a military nature committed during the time of war.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of Azerbaijan to the said Protocol.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Second Optional Protocol between Azerbaijan and Finland. The Optional Protocol will thus become operative between the two states without Azerbaijan benefitting from the reservation."

GermanyMarch 2000):

"The reservation allows the application of the death penalty for grave crimes committed during war 'or in condition of the threat of war'. Thus the reservation is partly in contradiction of article 2 of the Protocol since it does not limit the application of the death penalty to the most serious crimes of a military nature committed during the time of war.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the reservation by the Government of Azerbaijan. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Protocol between Azerbaijan and Germany."

Sweden (27 April 2000):

"The Government of Sweden recalls that reservations other than the kind referred to in Article 2 of the Protocol are not permitted. The reservation made by the Government of Azerbaijan goes beyond the limit of Article 2 of the Protocol, as it does not limit the application of the death penalty to the most serious crimes of a military nature committed during the time of war.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Azerbaijan to the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This shall not preclude the entry into force of the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights between the Republic of Azerbaijan and the Kingdom of Sweden, without Azerbaijan benefiting from the reservation."

Netherlands (17 July 2000)

" The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands notes that, according to Article 2 of the Second Optional Protocol, a reservation other than the kind referred to in the same Article is not acceptable. The reservation made by the Government of Azerbaijan is in contradiction with Article 2 as it does not limit the application of death penalty to the most serious crimes of a military nature committed during the time of war.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objehe aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Azerbaijan.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Azerbaijan."

Subsequently, on 28 September 2000, the Government of Azerbaijan communicated to the Secretary-General a modification to its reservation made upon accession. Within a period of 12 months from the date of its circulation, i.e. on 5 October 2000, none of the Contracting States to the Protocol notified the Secretary-General of an objection. Consequently, the modified reservation was deemed to have been accepted for deposit upon the expiration of the 12 month period, i.e., on 5 October 2001.

13. International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families

New York, 18 December 1990

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 2003, in accordance with article 87(1).
REGISTRATION: 1 July 2003, No. 39481.
STATUS: Signatories: 30. Parties: 41.
TEXT: Doc. A/RES/45/158.

Note: The Convention, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, was adopted by Resolution 45/158[1] of 18 December 1990 at the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Convention is open for signature by all States in accordance with its article 86 (1).

Participant	*Signature, Succession to signature(d)*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Albania		5 Jun 2007 a
Algeria		21 Apr 2005 a
Argentina	10 Aug 2004	23 Feb 2007
Azerbaijan		11 Jan 1999 a
Bangladesh	7 Oct 1998	
Belize		14 Nov 2001 a
Benin	15 Sep 2005	
Bolivia		16 Oct 2000 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina		13 Dec 1996 a
Burkina Faso	16 Nov 2001	26 Nov 2003
Cambodia	27 Sep 2004	
Cape Verde		16 Sep 1997 a
Chile	24 Sep 1993	21 Mar 2005
Colombia		24 May 1995 a
Comoros	22 Sep 2000	
Congo	29 Sep 2008	
Ecuador		5 Feb 2002 a
Egypt		19 Feb 1993 a
El Salvador	13 Sep 2002	14 Mar 2003
Gabon	15 Dec 2004	
Ghana	7 Sep 2000	7 Sep 2000
Guatemala	7 Sep 2000	14 Mar 2003
Guinea		7 Sep 2000 a
Guinea-Bissau	12 Sep 2000	
Guyana	15 Sep 2005	
Honduras		9 Aug 2005 a
Indonesia	22 Sep 2004	
Jamaica	25 Sep 2008	25 Sep 2008
Kyrgyzstan		29 Sep 2003 a
Lesotho	24 Sep 2004	16 Sep 2005
Liberia	22 Sep 2004	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		18 Jun 2004 a
Mali		5 Jun 2003 a
Mauritania		22 Jan 2007 a
Mexico	22 May 1991	8 Mar 1999
Montenegro[2]	23 Oct 2006 d	
Morocco	15 Aug 1991	21 Jun 1993
Nicaragua		26 Oct 2005 a
Niger		18 Mar 2009 a
Paraguay	13 Sep 2000	23 Sep 2008
Peru	22 Sep 2004	14 Sep 2005
Philippines	15 Nov 1993	5 Jul 1995
Rwanda		15 Dec 2008 a
Sao Tome and Principe	6 Sep 2000	
Senegal		9 Jun 1999 a
Serbia	11 Nov 2004	
Seychelles		15 Dec 1994 a
Sierra Leone	15 Sep 2000	
Sri Lanka		11 Mar 1996 a
Syrian Arab Republic		2 Jun 2005 a
Tajikistan	7 Sep 2000	8 Jan 2002
Timor-Leste		30 Jan 2004 a
Togo	15 Nov 2001	
Turkey	13 Jan 1999	27 Sep 2004
Uganda		14 Nov 1995 a
Uruguay		15 Feb 2001 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ALGERIA

Reservation:

The Government of the People's Algerian Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by article 92, paragraph 1 of this Convention which provides that any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the present Convention, that is not settled by negotiation shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice.

The Government of the People's Algerian Democratic Republic considers that any such dispute may be submitted to arbitration only with the agreement of all the parties to the conflict.

ARGENTINA

Declaration:

As provided for in article 92 (2), the Republic of Argentina does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 92 (1) of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families.

CHILE

Reservations:

The Republic of Chile makes a reservation with respect to the provisions of article 22, paragraph 5, of this Convention which it considers to be inapplicable to Chile.

The Republic of Chile will consider the provisions of article 48, paragraph 2, to be fulfilled under the terms of international conventions for the avoidance of double taxation that either have been entered into or will be entered into in the future.

COLOMBIA

Reservation:

Articles 15, 46 and 47 of the [said Convention], which was adopted by means of Act No. 146 of 1994, shall be executed with the understanding that the State of Colombia retains the right to promulgate taxation, exchange and monetary regulations establishing equality of treatment of migrant workers and their families with that of nationals in respect of the import and export of personal and household effects and the transfer of earnings and savings abroad, and in respect of expropriation for reasons of equity and the nullification of ownership of property in the cases envisaged in article 34 of the Political Constitution.

EGYPT

Reservation concerning article 4:

For the purposes of the present Convention the term `members of the family' refers to persons married to migrant workers or having with them a relationship that, according to applicable law, produces effects equivalent to marriage, as well as their dependent children and other dependent persons who are recognized as members of the family by applicable legislation or applicable bilateral or multilateral agreements between the States concerned.

Reservation concerning article 18, paragraph 6:

When a migrant worker or a member of his or her family has, by a final decision, been convicted of a criminal offence and when subsequently his or her conviction has been reversed or he or she has been pardoned on the ground that a new or newly discovered fact shows conclusively that there has been a miscarriage of justice, the person who has suffered punishment as a result of such conviction shall be compensated according to law, unless it is proved that the non-disclosure of the unknown fact in time is wholly or partially attributable to that person.

EL SALVADOR

Declarations:

The Government of the Republic of El Salvador does not consider itself bound by article 92, paragraph 1, of the Convention. With respect to articles 46, 47, 48 and 61, paragraph 4, governing exemption from import and export duties and taxes in respect of personal and household effects and the right to transfer earnings and savings, the Government of El Salvador wishes to make it clear that the exemption shall apply only after any taxes that the articles in question might incur have been paid. Moreover, the right of workers to transfer their earnings to their State of origin or State of habitual residence may be exercised without restriction, provided that the tax obligations arising in each particular case have been fulfilled. With regard to article 32, transfer of earnings and savings shall include amounts accumulated under retirement social security schemes, whether public or private. The Government of the Republic of El Salvador wishes to reiterate its respect for all universal and regional human rights principles and norms enshrined in international human rights instruments.

GUATEMALA

11 September 2007

Declarations:

[Agrees to] recognize the competence of the Committee on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families to receive and examine communications in which one State Party to the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families alleges non-compliance by another State Party with obligations arising under the Convention, as well as to receive and examine communications sent by persons subject to the jurisdiction of a State Party, alleging the violation by that State Party of their individual rights as recognized under the Convention.

MEXICO

Interpretative declaration:

Upon ratifying the [Convention], the Government of the United Mexican States reaffirms its political will to ensure international protection of the rights of all migrant workers, in accordance with this international instrument. all the provisions of this Convention will be applied in conformity with its national legislation.

Reservation:

The Government of the United Mexican States makes an express reservation with regard to article 22, paragraph 4, of this Convention, insofar as it refers to the application of article 33 of the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States and article 125 of the General Population Act.

15 September 2008

Declaration under article 77:

The United Mexican States recognizes as fully binding the competence of the Committee on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, established by the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families adopted in New York on 18 December 1990.

In accordance with article 77 of the Convention, the United Mexican States declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim that the United Mexican States has violated their individual rights as established by the Convention.

MOROCCO

Reservation:

The Government of the Kingdom of Morocco does not consider itself bound by article 92, paragraph 1 of this Convention which provides that any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the present Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration.

The Government of the Kingdom of Morocco considers that any such dispute may be submitted to arbitration only with the agreement of all the parties to the conflict.

NICARAGUA

Declaration and reservation:

Declaration

The Republic of Nicaragua, onacceding to this Convention, agrees to apply it in accordance with its domestic laws.

Reservations:

The Republic of Nicaragua, in the exercise of its sovereignty, does not allow foreigners to enjoy political rights; this is embodied in articles 27 and 182 of the Constitution.

Article 91 of the Convention establishes the possibility of formulating reservations at the time of signature, ratification or accession. Consequently, by virtue of the provisions of article 42, paragraph 3, of this Convention, the Republic of Nicaragua will not grant political rights to migratory workers owing to the express prohibition contained in article 27, paragraph 2, of its Constitution, which states:

"Foreigners have the same rights and obligations as Nicaraguans, with the exception of political rights and others established by law; they may not intervene in the political affairs of the country."

The Republic of Nicaragua considers that this reservation is not incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

SRI LANKA

Declarations:

Article 8 (2):

"The right of non-Sri Lankans to enter and remain in Sri Lanka shall be subject to existing visa regulations.

Article 29:

According to the citizenship Act No. 18 of 1948, citizenship rights flow from the father and in the event a child is born out of wedlock, from the mother. A child will be deemed to be a citizen of Sri Lanka if he and his father were born in Sri Lanka before 1.11.49 or if at the time of his birth the father was a Sri Lankan.

Article 49:

Resident visas to expatriate workers are allowed in respect of identified professions where there is a dearth of qualified personnel. Existing visa regulations do not permit migrant workers either to change their professions or the institutions in which they have been authorised to work, which is the basis on which the visa is issued.

Article 54:

Protection against dismissal, quantum of remuneration, period of employment, etc., are governed by the terms of individual contracts entered into between the worker and the organisation which employs him. A visa issued to an expatriate worker under the visa regulations is limited to a pre-identified job assignment."

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Declaration:

.....accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to the said Convention thereof by its Government does not, in any way, imply recognition of Israel, nor shall it lead to any such dealing with the latter as are governed by the provisions of the Convention.

TURKEY

Declarations:

"A) The declaration regarding Article 15:

The restrictions by the related Turkish laws regarding acquisition of immovable property by the foreigners are preserved....

B) The reservation regarding Article 40:

The Turkish Law on Trade Unions allows only the Turkish citizens to form trade unions in Turkey."

C) The declaration regarding Article 45:

The stipulations of the paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of the Article 45 will be implemented in accordance with the provisions of the Turkish Constitution and the related Laws.

D) The declaration regarding Article 46:

The implementation of the Article 46 will be made in accordance with the national laws.

E) The declaration regarding Articles 76 and 77:

Turkey will recognize the competence of the Committee on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families at a later time."

UGANDA

Reservation:

Article 18:

"The Republic of Uganda cannot guarantee at all times to provide free legal assistance in accordance with the provisions of article 18 paragraph 3(d)."

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 49 (A/45/49)* , p. 261.

[2] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

14. AGREEMENT ESTABLISHING THE FUND FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INDIGENOUS PEOPLES OF LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Madrid, 24 July 1992

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	4 August 1993, in accordance with article 14(2).
REGISTRATION:	4 August 1993, No. 30177.
STATUS:	Signatories: 23. Parties: 22.
TEXT:	Document of the Intergovernmental Technical Meeting for the Preparation of the Indigenous Fund, La Paz, Bolivia, of 20 June 1992.

Note: The Agreement, of which the English, Portuguese and Spanish texts are equally authentic, was adopted during the Second Summit Meeting of Ibero-American Heads of State, held at Madrid from 23 to 24 July 1992. In accordance with its article 14 (1), the Agreement was opened for signature at Madrid on 24 July 1992 and shall remain open for signature at the Headquarters of the United Nations.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification*
Argentina	24 Jul 1992	18 Mar 1996
Belgium	18 Nov 1993	27 Jun 1996
Belize	1 Feb 1996	1 Feb 1996
Bolivia	24 Jul 1992	4 Aug 1993
Brazil	24 Jul 1992	17 Jun 1998
Chile	24 Jul 1992	31 Oct 1995
Colombia	24 Jul 1992	9 May 1995
Costa Rica	24 Jul 1992	15 Mar 1996
Cuba	24 Jul 1992	13 Dec 1994
Dominican Republic	24 Jul 1992	
Ecuador	24 Jul 1992	26 Oct 1994
El Salvador	24 Jul 1992	12 May 1995
Guatemala	24 Jul 1992	28 Nov 2000
Honduras	24 Jul 1992	10 May 1995
Mexico	24 Jul 1992	12 Jul 1993
Nicaragua	24 Jul 1992	10 Jul 1995
Panama	24 Jul 1992	10 Feb 1994
Paraguay	24 Jul 1992	1 Dec 1994
Peru	1 Oct 1992	19 Apr 1993
Portugal	24 Jul 1992	23 Jun 1995
Spain	24 Jul 1992	7 Dec 1994
Uruguay	24 Jul 1992	17 Feb 1999
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	11 Feb 1993	13 May 2002

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification.)

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Declaration:

In signing the present Agreement, the Republic of Venezuela understands that, under the provisions of article 1, the process of self-development of indigenous peoples, communities and organizations can in no way affect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Venezuela or the unity of its peoples.

15. CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

New York, 13 December 2006

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 May 2008, in accordance with article 45(1).
REGISTRATION: 3 May 2008, No. 44910.
STATUS: Signatories: 139. Parties: 50.
TEXT: Doc.A/61/611.

Note: The above Convention was adopted on 13 December 2006 during the sixty-first session of the General Assembly by resolution A/RES/61/106. In accordance with its article 42, the Convention shall be open for signature by all States and by regional integration organizations at United Nations Headquarters in New York as of 30 March 2007.

Participant	*Signature*	*Formal confirmation(c), Accession(a), Ratification*
Algeria	30 Mar 2007	
Andorra	27 Apr 2007	
Antigua and Barbuda	30 Mar 2007	
Argentina	30 Mar 2007	2 Sep 2008
Armenia	30 Mar 2007	
Australia	30 Mar 2007	17 Jul 2008
Austria	30 Mar 2007	26 Sep 2008
Azerbaijan	9 Jan 2008	28 Jan 2009
Bahrain	25 Jun 2007	
Bangladesh	9 May 2007	30 Nov 2007
Barbados	19 Jul 2007	
Belgium	30 Mar 2007	
Benin	8 Feb 2008	
Bolivia	13 Aug 2007	
Brazil	30 Mar 2007	1 Aug 2008
Brunei Darussalam	18 Dec 2007	
Bulgaria	27 Sep 2007	
Burkina Faso	23 May 2007	
Burundi	26 Apr 2007	
Cambodia	1 Oct 2007	
Cameroon	1 Oct 2008	
Canada	30 Mar 2007	
Cape Verde	30 Mar 2007	
Central African Republic	9 May 2007	
Chile	30 Mar 2007	29 Jul 2008
China[1]	30 Mar 2007	1 Aug 2008
Colombia	30 Mar 2007	
Comoros	26 Sep 2007	
Congo	30 Mar 2007	
Costa Rica	30 Mar 2007	1 Oct 2008
Côte d'Ivoire	7 Jun 2007	
Croatia	30 Mar 2007	15 Aug 2007
Cuba	26 Apr 2007	6 Sep 2007
Cyprus	30 Mar 2007	
Czech Republic	30 Mar 2007	
Denmark	30 Mar 2007	
Dominica	30 Mar 2007	
Dominican Republic	30 Mar 2007	
Ecuador	30 Mar 2007	3 Apr 2008
Egypt	4 Apr 2007	14 Apr 2008
El Salvador	30 Mar 2007	14 Dec 2007
Estonia	25 Sep 2007	
Ethiopia	30 Mar 2007	
European Community	30 Mar 2007	
Finland	30 Mar 2007	
France	30 Mar 2007	
Gabon	30 Mar 2007	1 Oct 2007
Germany	30 Mar 2007	24 Feb 2009
Ghana	30 Mar 2007	
Greece	30 Mar 2007	
Guatemala	30 Mar 2007	
Guinea	16 May 2007	8 Feb 2008
Guyana	11 Apr 2007	
Honduras	30 Mar 2007	14 Apr 2008
Hungary	30 Mar 2007	20 Jul 2007
Iceland	30 Mar 2007	
India	30 Mar 2007	1 Oct 2007
Indonesia	30 Mar 2007	
Ireland	30 Mar 2007	
Israel	30 Mar 2007	
Italy	30 Mar 2007	
Jamaica	30 Mar 2007	30 Mar 2007
Japan	28 Sep 2007	
Jordan	30 Mar 2007	31 Mar 2008
Kazakhstan	11 Dec 2008	

Participant	*Signature*	*Formal confirmation(c), Accession(a), Ratification*
Kenya	30 Mar 2007	19 May 2008
Lao People's Democratic Republic	15 Jan 2008	
Latvia	18 Jul 2008	
Lebanon	14 Jun 2007	
Lesotho		2 Dec 2008 a
Liberia	30 Mar 2007	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	1 May 2008	
Lithuania	30 Mar 2007	
Luxembourg	30 Mar 2007	
Madagascar	25 Sep 2007	
Malawi	27 Sep 2007	
Malaysia	8 Apr 2008	
Maldives	2 Oct 2007	
Mali	15 May 2007	7 Apr 2008
Malta	30 Mar 2007	
Mauritius	25 Sep 2007	
Mexico	30 Mar 2007	17 Dec 2007
Montenegro	27 Sep 2007	
Morocco	30 Mar 2007	
Mozambique	30 Mar 2007	
Namibia	25 Apr 2007	4 Dec 2007
Nepal	3 Jan 2008	
Netherlands	30 Mar 2007	
New Zealand[2]	30 Mar 2007	25 Sep 2008
Nicaragua	30 Mar 2007	7 Dec 2007
Niger	30 Mar 2007	24 Jun 2008
Nigeria	30 Mar 2007	
Norway	30 Mar 2007	
Oman	17 Mar 2008	6 Jan 2009
Pakistan	25 Sep 2008	
Panama	30 Mar 2007	7 Aug 2007
Paraguay	30 Mar 2007	3 Sep 2008
Peru	30 Mar 2007	30 Jan 2008
Philippines	25 Sep 2007	15 Apr 2008
Poland	30 Mar 2007	
Portugal	30 Mar 2007	
Qatar	9 Jul 2007	13 May 2008
Republic of Korea	30 Mar 2007	11 Dec 2008
Republic of Moldova	30 Mar 2007	
Romania	26 Sep 2007	
Russian Federation	24 Sep 2008	
Rwanda		15 Dec 2008 a
San Marino	30 Mar 2007	22 Feb 2008
Saudi Arabia		24 Jun 2008 a
Senegal	25 Apr 2007	
Serbia	17 Dec 2007	
Seychelles	30 Mar 2007	
Sierra Leone	30 Mar 2007	
Slovakia	26 Sep 2007	
Slovenia	30 Mar 2007	24 Apr 2008
Solomon Islands	23 Sep 2008	
South Africa	30 Mar 2007	30 Nov 2007
Spain	30 Mar 2007	3 Dec 2007
Sri Lanka	30 Mar 2007	
Sudan	30 Mar 2007	
Suriname	30 Mar 2007	
Swaziland	25 Sep 2007	
Sweden	30 Mar 2007	15 Dec 2008
Syrian Arab Republic	30 Mar 2007	
Thailand	30 Mar 2007	29 Jul 2008
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	30 Mar 2007	
Togo	23 Sep 2008	
Tonga	15 Nov 2007	
Trinidad and Tobago	27 Sep 2007	
Tunisia	30 Mar 2007	2 Apr 2008
Turkey	30 Mar 2007	
Turkmenistan		4 Sep 2008 a
Uganda	30 Mar 2007	25 Sep 2008
Ukraine	24 Sep 2008	
United Arab Emirates	8 Feb 2008	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	30 Mar 2007	
United Republic of Tanzania	30 Mar 2007	
Uruguay	3 Apr 2007	11 Feb 2009
Uzbekistan	27 Feb 2009	
Vanuatu	17 May 2007	23 Oct 2008
Viet Nam	22 Oct 2007	
Yemen	30 Mar 2007	
Zambia	9 May 2008	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, formal confirmation or accession.)

AUSTRALIA

Upon ratification

Declaration:

"Australia recognizes that persons with disability enjoy legal capacity on an equal basis with others in all aspects of life. Australia declares its understanding that the Convention allows for fully supported or substituted decision-making arrangements, which provide for decisions to be made on behalf of a person, only where such arrangements are necessary, as a last resort and subject to safeguards;

Australia recognizes that every person with disability has a right to respect for his or her physical and mental integrity on an equal basis with others. Australia further declares its understanding that the Convention allows for compulsory assistance or treatment of persons, including measures taken for the treatment of mental disability, where such treatment is necessary, as a last resort and subject to safeguards;

Australia recognizes the rights of persons with disability to liberty of movement, to freedom to choose their residence and to a nationality, on an equal basis with others. Australia further declares its understanding that the Convention does not create a right for a person to enter or remain in a country of which he or she is not a national, nor impact on Australia's health requirements for non-nationals seeking to enter or remain in Australia, where these requirements are based on legitimate, objective and reasonable criteria."

AZERBAIJAN

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

"The Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it is unable to guarantee the application of the provisions of the Convention in the territories occupied by the Republic of Armenia until these territories are liberated from occupation."

BELGIUM

Declaration made upon signature:

This signature is equally binding on the French community, the Flemish community, the German-speaking community, the Wallone region, the Flemish region and the region of the capital-Brussels.

EGYPT

Interpretative declaration made upon signature:

The Arab Republic of Egypt declares that its interpretation of article 12 of the International Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which deals with the recognition of persons with disabilities on an equal basis with others before the law, with regard to the concept of legal capacity dealt with in paragraph 2 of the said article, is that persons with disabilities enjoy the capacity to acquire rights and assume legal responsibility ('ahliyyat al-wujub) but not the capacity to perform ('ahliyyat al-'ada'), under Egyptian law.

EL SALVADOR

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Government of the Republic of El Salvador signs the present Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Optional Protocol thereto, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 13 December 2006, to the extent that its provisions do not prejudice or violate the provisions of any of the precepts, principles and norms enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic of El Salvador, particularly in its enumeration of principles.

MALTA

Interpretative statement and reservation made upon signature:

"(a) Pursuant to Article 25 of the Convention, Malta makes the following Interpretative Statement - Malta understands that the phrase "sexual and reproductive health" in Art 25 (a) of the Convention does not constitute recognition of any new international law obligation, does not create any abortion rights, and cannot be interpreted to constitute support, endorsement, or promotion of abortion. Malta further understands that the use of this phrase is intended exclusively to underline the point that where health services are provided, they are provided without discrimination on the basis of disability.

Malta's national legislation, considers the termination of pregnancy through induced abortion as illegal.

(b) Pursuant to Article 29)a) (i) and (iii) of the Convention, while the Government of Malta is fully committed to ensure the effective and full participation of persons with disabilities in political and public life, including the exercise of their right to vote by secret ballot in elections and referenda, and to stand for elections, Malta makes the following reservations:

With regard to (a) (i)

At this stage, Malta reserves the right to continue to apply its current electoral legislation in so far as voting procedures, facilities and materials are concerned.

With regard to (a) (iii)

Malta reserves the right to continue to apply its current electoral legislation in so far as assistance in voting procedures is concerned."

MAURITIUS

Reservation made upon signature:

"The Government of the Republic of Mauritius makes the following reservations in relation to Article 11 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities which pertains to situations of risk and humanitarian emergencies.

The Government of Mauritius signs the present Convention subject to the reservation that it does not consider itself bound to take measures specified in article 11 unless permitted by domestic legislation expressly providing for the taking of such measures."

MEXICO

Interpretative declaration

"The Political Constitution of the United Mexican States, in its article 1, establishes that: "(...) any discrimination on the grounds of ethnic or national origin, gender, age, disability, social status, health, religion, opinion, preference, civil status or any other form of discrimination that is an affront to human dignity and is intended to deny or undermine the rights and freedoms of persons is prohibited".

In ratifying this Convention, the United Mexican States reaffirms its commitment to promoting and protecting the rights of Mexicans who suffer any disability, whether they are within the national territory or abroad.

The Mexican State reiterates its firm commitment to creating conditions that allow all individuals to develop in a holistic manner and to exercise their rights and freedoms fully and without discrimination.

Accordingly, affirming its absolute determination to protect the rights and dignity of persons with disabilities, the United Mexican States interprets paragraph 2 of article 12 of the Convention to mean that in the case of conflict between that paragraph and national legislation, the provision that confers the greatest legal protection while safeguarding the dignity and ensuring the physical, psychological and emotional integrity of persons and protecting the integrity of their property shall apply, in strict accordance with the principle pro homine."

NETHERLANDS

Declarations made upon signature:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands hereby expresses its intention to ratify the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, subject to the following declarations and such further declarations and reservations as it may deem necessary upon ratification of the Convention.

Article 10

The Kingdom of the Netherlands acknowledges that unborn human life is worthy of protection. The Kingdom interprets the scope of Article 10 to the effect that such protection - and thereby the term 'human being' - is a matter for national legislation.

Article 15

The Netherlands declares that it will interpret the term 'consent' in Article 15 in conformity with international instruments, such as the Council of Europe Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine and the Additional Protocol concerning Biomedical Research, and with national legislation which is in line with these instruments. This means that, as far as biomedical research is concerned, the term 'consent' applies to two different situations:

1. consent given by a person who is able to consent, and

2. in the case of persons who are not able to give their consent, permission given by their representative or an authority or body provided for by law.

The Netherlands considers it important that persons who are unable to give their free and informed consent receive specific protection. In addition to the permission referred to under 2. above, other protective measures as included in the above-mentioned international instruments are considered to be part of this protection.

Article 23

With regard to Article 23 paragraph 1 (b), the Netherlands declares that the best interests of the child shall be paramount.

Article 25

The individual autonomy of the person is an important principle laid down in Article 3 (a) of the Convention. The Netherlands understands Article 25 (f) in the light of this autonomy. This provision is interpreted to mean that good care involves respecting a persishes with regard to medical treatment, food and fluids."

POLAND

Reservation made upon signature:

"The Republic of Poland understands that Articles 23.1 (b) and 25 (a) shall not be interpreted in a way conferring an individual right to abortion or mandating state party to provide access thereto."

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Upon ratification

Reservation:

"..... with a reservation on the provision regarding life insurance in the paragraph (e) of the Article 25."

THAILAND

Interpretative declaration:

"The Kingdom of Thailand hereby declares that the application of Article 18 of the Convention shall be subject to the national laws, regulations and practices in Thailand."

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

AUSTRIA

26 September 2008

With regard to the reservation made by El Salvador upon signarue and confirmed upon ratification

"The Government of Austria has examined the reservation to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and Optional Protocol thereto made by the Government of El Salvador.

According to its reservation, El Salvador envisages becoming Party to the Convention only to the extent that its provisions do not prejudice or violate the provisions of any of the precepts, principles and norms enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic of El Salvador, particularly in its enumeration of principles. In the absence of further clarification, this reservation does not clearly specify the extent of El Salvador's derogation from the provisions of the Convention. This general and vague wording of the reservation raises doubts as to the degree of commitment assumed by El Salvador in becoming a party to the Convention and is therefore incompatible with international law.

The Government of Austria objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of El Salvador to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and Optional Protocol thereto.

This objection, however, does not preclude the entry into force, in its entirety, of the Convention between Austria and El Salvador."

NETHERLANDS

22 January 2009

With regard to the reservation made by El Salvador upon signarue and confirmed upon ratification

"The Government of Kingdom of the Netherlands has carefully examined the reservation made by the

Government of the Republic of El Salvador upon signature and confirmed upon ratification to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, done at New York on 13 December 200[6].

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that with this reservation the application of the Convention is made subject to the constitutional law in force in the Republic of El Salvador. This makes it unclear to what extent the Republic of El Salvador considers itself bound by the obligations of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that such a reservation must be regarded as incompatible with the object and purpose of the said instrument and would recall that, according to Article 46, paragraph 1 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of El Salvador to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that the reservation of the Government of the Republic of El Salvador does not exclude or modify the legal effect of the provisions of the Convention in their application to the Republic of El Salvador.

This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Republic of El Salvador."

SWEDEN

23 January 2009

With regard to the reservation made by El Salvador upon signarue and confirmed upon ratification

".....the Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of El Salvador upon ratifying the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

According to international customary law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of all States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties, are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any

legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden notes that El Salvador in its reservation gives precedence to its Constitution over the Convention. The Government of Sweden is of the view that such a reservation, which does not clearly specify the extent of the derogation, raises serious doubt as to the commitment of El Salvador to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Republic of El Salvador to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and considers the reservation null and void. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between El Salvador and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between

El Salvador and Sweden, without El Salvador benefiting from its reservation."

Notes:

[1] On 1 August 2008, the Secretary-General received from the Government of China the following declarations in respect of Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and Macao Special Administrative Region:

In accordance with the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and the Basic Law of the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, the Government of the People's Republic of China decides that the Convention shall apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

The application of the provisions regarding Liberty of movement and nationality of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, shall not change the validity of relevant laws on immigration control and nationality application of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

[2] On 25 September 2008, the Secretary-General received from the Government of New Zealand the following declaration:

".....consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand to the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, this ratification shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory....."

15. a) Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

New York, 13 December 2006

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 May 2008, in accordance with article 13(1).
REGISTRATION: 3 May 2008, No. 44910.
STATUS: Signatories: 82. Parties: 29.
TEXT: Doc.A/61/611.

Note: The above Optional Protocol was adopted on 13 December 2006 during the sixty-first session of the General Assembly by resolution A/RES/61/106. In accordance with its article 10, the Optional Protocol shall be open for signature by all signatory States and regional integration organizations of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities at United Nations Headquarters in New York as of 30 March 2007.

Participant	*Signature*	*Formal confirmation(c), Accession(a), Ratification*
Algeria	30 Mar 2007	
Andorra	27 Apr 2007	
Antigua and Barbuda	30 Mar 2007	
Argentina	30 Mar 2007	2 Sep 2008
Armenia	30 Mar 2007	
Austria	30 Mar 2007	26 Sep 2008
Azerbaijan	9 Jan 2008	28 Jan 2009
Bangladesh		12 May 2008 a
Belgium	30 Mar 2007	
Benin	8 Feb 2008	
Bolivia	13 Aug 2007	
Brazil	30 Mar 2007	1 Aug 2008
Bulgaria	18 Dec 2008	
Burkina Faso	23 May 2007	
Burundi	26 Apr 2007	
Cambodia	1 Oct 2007	
Cameroon	1 Oct 2008	
Central African Republic	9 May 2007	
Chile	30 Mar 2007	29 Jul 2008
Congo	30 Mar 2007	
Costa Rica	30 Mar 2007	1 Oct 2008
Côte d'Ivoire	7 Jun 2007	
Croatia	30 Mar 2007	15 Aug 2007
Cyprus	30 Mar 2007	
Czech Republic	30 Mar 2007	
Dominican Republic	30 Mar 2007	
Ecuador	30 Mar 2007	3 Apr 2008
El Salvador	30 Mar 2007	14 Dec 2007
Finland	30 Mar 2007	
France	23 Sep 2008	
Gabon	25 Sep 2007	
Germany	30 Mar 2007	24 Feb 2009
Ghana	30 Mar 2007	
Guatemala	30 Mar 2007	
Guinea	31 Aug 2007	8 Feb 2008
Honduras	23 Aug 2007	
Hungary	30 Mar 2007	20 Jul 2007
Iceland	30 Mar 2007	
Italy	30 Mar 2007	
Jamaica	30 Mar 2007	
Jordan	30 Mar 2007	
Kazakhstan	11 Dec 2008	
Lebanon	14 Jun 2007	
Liberia	30 Mar 2007	
Lithuania	30 Mar 2007	
Luxembourg	30 Mar 2007	
Madagascar	25 Sep 2007	
Mali	15 May 2007	7 Apr 2008
Malta	30 Mar 2007	
Mauritius	25 Sep 2007	
Mexico	30 Mar 2007	17 Dec 2007
Montenegro	27 Sep 2007	
Namibia	25 Apr 2007	4 Dec 2007
Nepal	3 Jan 2008	
Nicaragua	21 Oct 2008	
Niger	2 Aug 2007	24 Jun 2008
Nigeria	30 Mar 2007	
Panama	30 Mar 2007	7 Aug 2007
Paraguay	30 Mar 2007	3 Sep 2008
Peru	30 Mar 2007	30 Jan 2008
Portugal	30 Mar 2007	

Participant	Signature	Formal confirmation(c), Accession(a), Ratification
Qatar	9 Jul 2007	
Romania	25 Sep 2008	
Rwanda		15 Dec 2008 a
San Marino	30 Mar 2007	22 Feb 2008
Saudi Arabia		24 Jun 2008 a
Senegal	25 Apr 2007	
Serbia	17 Dec 2007	
Seychelles	30 Mar 2007	
Sierra Leone	30 Mar 2007	
Slovakia	26 Sep 2007	
Slovenia	30 Mar 2007	24 Apr 2008
South Africa	30 Mar 2007	30 Nov 2007
Spain	30 Mar 2007	3 Dec 2007
Swaziland	25 Sep 2007	
Sweden	30 Mar 2007	15 Dec 2008
Togo	23 Sep 2008	
Tunisia	30 Mar 2007	2 Apr 2008
Uganda	30 Mar 2007	25 Sep 2008
Ukraine	24 Sep 2008	
United Arab Emirates	12 Feb 2008	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	26 Feb 2009	
United Republic of Tanzania	29 Sep 2008	
Yemen	11 Apr 2007	
Zambia	29 Sep 2008	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

AZERBAIJAN

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

"The Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it is unable to guarantee the application of the provisions of the Protocol in the territories occupied by the Republic of Armenia until these territories are liberated from occupation."

EL SALVADOR

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Government of the Republic of El Salvador signs the present Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Optional Protocol thereto, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 13 December 2006, to the extent that its provisions do not prejudice or violate the provisions of any of the precepts, principles and norms enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic of El Salvador, particularly in its enumeration of principles.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

AUSTRIA

&lt;Right&gt;26 September 2008</Right&gt;

With regard to the reservation made by El Salvador upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The Government of Austria has examined the reservation to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and Optional Protocol thereto made by the Government of El Salvador.

According to its reservation, El Salvador envisages becoming Party to the Convention only to the extent that its provisions do not prejudice or violate the provisions of any of the precepts, principles and norms enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic of El Salvador, particularly in its enumeration of principles. In the absence of further clarification, this reservation does not clearly specify the extent of El Salvador's derogation from the provisions of the Convention. This general and vague wording of the reservation raises doubts as to the degree of commitment assumed by El Salvador in becoming a party to the Convention and is therefore incompatible with international law.

The Government of Austria objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of El Salvador to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and Optional Protocol thereto.

This objection, however, does not preclude the entry into force, in its entirety, of the Convention between Austria and El Salvador."

16. INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF ALL PERSONS FROM ENFORCED DISAPPEARANCE

New York, 20 December 2006

NOT YET IN FORCE:	in accordance with article 39which reads as follows: "This Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the twentieth instrument of ratification or accession. 2. For each State ratifying or acceding to this Convention after the deposit of the twentieth instrument of ratification or accession, this Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after the date of the deposit of that State's instrument of ratification or accession.".
STATUS:	Signatories: 81. Parties: 10.
TEXT:	Doc.A/61/488. C.N.737.2008.TREATIES-12 of 2 October 2008 (Proposal of corrections to the original text of the Convention (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts) and to the Certified True Copies) and C.N.1040.2008.TREATIES-20 of 2 January 2009 (Corrections).

Note: The above Convention was adopted on 20 December 2006 during the sixty-first session of the General Assembly by resolution A/RES/61/177. In accordance with its article 38, the Convention shall be open for signature by all Member States of the United Nations. The Convention shall be open for signature on 6 February 2007 in Paris, France, and thereafter at United Nations Headquarters in New York.

Participant	*Signature*	*Accession(a), Ratification*
Albania	6 Feb 2007	8 Nov 2007
Algeria	6 Feb 2007	
Argentina	6 Feb 2007	14 Dec 2007
Armenia	10 Apr 2007	
Austria	6 Feb 2007	
Azerbaijan	6 Feb 2007	
Belgium	6 Feb 2007	
Bolivia	6 Feb 2007	17 Dec 2008
Bosnia and Herzegovina	6 Feb 2007	
Brazil	6 Feb 2007	
Bulgaria	24 Sep 2008	
Burkina Faso	6 Feb 2007	
Burundi	6 Feb 2007	
Cameroon	6 Feb 2007	
Cape Verde	6 Feb 2007	
Chad	6 Feb 2007	
Chile	6 Feb 2007	
Colombia	27 Sep 2007	
Comoros	6 Feb 2007	
Congo	6 Feb 2007	
Costa Rica	6 Feb 2007	
Croatia	6 Feb 2007	
Cuba	6 Feb 2007	2 Feb 2009
Cyprus	6 Feb 2007	
Denmark	25 Sep 2007	
Ecuador	24 May 2007	
Finland	6 Feb 2007	
France	6 Feb 2007	23 Sep 2008
Gabon	25 Sep 2007	
Germany	26 Sep 2007	
Ghana	6 Feb 2007	
Greece	1 Oct 2008	
Grenada	6 Feb 2007	
Guatemala	6 Feb 2007	
Haiti	6 Feb 2007	
Honduras	6 Feb 2007	1 Apr 2008
Iceland	1 Oct 2008	
India	6 Feb 2007	
Ireland	29 Mar 2007	
Italy	3 Jul 2007	
Japan	6 Feb 2007	
Kazakhstan		27 Feb 2009 a
Kenya	6 Feb 2007	
Lao People's Democratic Republic	29 Sep 2008	
Lebanon	6 Feb 2007	
Liechtenstein	1 Oct 2007	
Lithuania	6 Feb 2007	
Luxembourg	6 Feb 2007	
Madagascar	6 Feb 2007	
Maldives	6 Feb 2007	
Mali	6 Feb 2007	
Malta	6 Feb 2007	
Mexico	6 Feb 2007	18 Mar 2008
Monaco	6 Feb 2007	
Mongolia	6 Feb 2007	

Participant	Signature	Accession(a), Ratification
Montenegro	6 Feb 2007	
Morocco	6 Feb 2007	
Mozambique	24 Dec 2008	
Netherlands	29 Apr 2008	
Niger	6 Feb 2007	
Norway	21 Dec 2007	
Panama	25 Sep 2007	
Paraguay	6 Feb 2007	
Portugal	6 Feb 2007	
Republic of Moldova	6 Feb 2007	
Romania	3 Dec 2008	
Samoa	6 Feb 2007	
Senegal	6 Feb 2007	11 Dec 2008
Serbia	6 Feb 2007	
Sierra Leone	6 Feb 2007	
Slovakia	26 Sep 2007	
Slovenia	26 Sep 2007	
Spain	27 Sep 2007	
Swaziland	25 Sep 2007	
Sweden	6 Feb 2007	
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	6 Feb 2007	
Tunisia	6 Feb 2007	
Uganda	6 Feb 2007	
United Republic of Tanzania	29 Sep 2008	
Uruguay	6 Feb 2007	4 Mar 2009
Vanuatu	6 Feb 2007	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	21 Oct 2008	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

CUBA

Upon Ratification

Declaration:

The Republic of Cuba hereby declares, in accordance with article 42, paragraph 2, that it does not consider itself obliged to refer its disputes to the International Court of Justice, as provided for in paragraph 1 of the same article.

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Reservation:

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, in accordance with article 42, paragraph 2, of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, hereby formulates a specific reservation concerning the provisions of paragraph 1 of that article. Therefore, it does not consider itself to be obliged to resort to arbitration as a dispute settlement mechanism, nor does it recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Declarations recognizing the competence of the Human Rights Committee under articles 31 and 32
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ALBANIA

8 November 2007

Article 31

In accordance with Article 31 of …..[the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance], the Republic of Albania declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation of provisions of this Convention by Albanian State.

Article 32

In accordance with Article 32 of …..[the International Convention for the Protection of all Persons from Enforced Disappearance], the Republic of Albania declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications in which a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

In accordance with Article 31 of this Convention, the Republic of Albania declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation of provisions of this Convention by Albanian State. In accordance with Article 32 of this Convention, the Republic of Albania declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications in which a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

ARGENTINA

11 June 2008

Article 31

In accordance with the provisions of article[s] 31, paragraph 1 ... of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, the Argentine Republic recognizes the competence of the Committee on Enforced Disappearances to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to the jurisdiction of the Argentine Republic claiming to be victims of a violation by the State of any of the provisions of the Convention ...

Article 32

In accordance with the provisions of ... article[s] 32 of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, the Argentine Republic recognizes the competence of the Committee on Enforced Disappearances ... to receive and consider communications in which a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

FRANCE

9 December 2008

Article 31

... in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 31, [France] recognizes the competence of the Committee on enforced disappearance to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation of provisions of this Convention by France.

Article 32

... in accordance with article 32, [France] recognizes the competence of the Committee on enforced disappearance to receive and consider communications in which a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

URUGUAY

Article 31

In accordance with article 31, paragraph 1, of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, the Eastern Republic of Uruguay recognizes the competence of the Committee on Enforced Disappearances to receive and consider communications submitted by or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation

by that State of the provisions of that Convention.

Article 32

... in accordance with article 32 of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, the Eastern Republic of Uruguay recognizes the competence of the Committee [on Enforced Disappearances] to receive and consider communications in which a State party claims that the Uruguayan State is not fulfilling its obligations under that Convention.

CHAPTER V

REFUGEES AND STATELESS PERSONS

1. CONSTITUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ORGANIZATION*

New York, 15 December 1946

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	20 August 1948, in accordance with article 18.
REGISTRATION:	20 August 1948, No. 283.
STATUS:	Signatories: 17. Parties: 19.
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 18, p. 3.
EXPIRATION:	15 February 1952

Note: The Constitution was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 62 (I) of 15 December 1946. Resolution No. 108, adopted by the General Council of the International Refugee Organization at its 101st meeting on 15 February 1952, provided for the liquidation of the Organization.

2. Convention relating to the Status of Refugees

Geneva, 28 July 1951

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 22 April 1954, in accordance with article 43.
REGISTRATION: 22 April 1954, No. 2545.
STATUS: Signatories: 19. Parties: 144.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 189, p. 137.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the United Nations Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Status of Refugees and Stateless Persons, held at Geneva from 2 to 25 July 1951. The Conference was convened pursuant to resolution 429 (V)[1], adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1950.

Participant	*Signature*	*Accession(a), Succession(d), Ratification*
Afghanistan		30 Aug 2005 a
Albania		18 Aug 1992 a
Algeria		21 Feb 1963 d
Angola		23 Jun 1981 a
Antigua and Barbuda		7 Sep 1995 a
Argentina		15 Nov 1961 a
Armenia		6 Jul 1993 a
Australia		22 Jan 1954 a
Austria	28 Jul 1951	1 Nov 1954
Azerbaijan		12 Feb 1993 a
Bahamas		15 Sep 1993 a
Belarus		23 Aug 2001 a
Belgium	28 Jul 1951	22 Jul 1953
Belize		27 Jun 1990 a
Benin		4 Apr 1962 d
Bolivia		9 Feb 1982 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]		1 Sep 1993 d
Botswana		6 Jan 1969 a
Brazil	15 Jul 1952	16 Nov 1960
Bulgaria		12 May 1993 a
Burkina Faso		18 Jun 1980 a
Burundi		19 Jul 1963 a
Cambodia		15 Oct 1992 a
Cameroon		23 Oct 1961 d
Canada		4 Jun 1969 a
Central African Republic		4 Sep 1962 d
Chad		19 Aug 1981 a
Chile		28 Jan 1972 a
China[3]		24 Sep 1982 a
Colombia	28 Jul 1951	10 Oct 1961
Congo		15 Oct 1962 d
Costa Rica		28 Mar 1978 a
Côte d'Ivoire		8 Dec 1961 d
Croatia[2]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cyprus		16 May 1963 d
Czech Republic[4]		11 May 1993 d
Democratic Republic of the Congo		19 Jul 1965 a
Denmark	28 Jul 1951	4 Dec 1952
Djibouti		9 Aug 1977 d
Dominica		17 Feb 1994 a
Dominican Republic		4 Jan 1978 a
Ecuador		17 Aug 1955 a
Egypt		22 May 1981 a
El Salvador		28 Apr 1983 a
Equatorial Guinea		7 Feb 1986 a
Estonia		10 Apr 1997 a
Ethiopia		10 Nov 1969 a
Fiji		12 Jun 1972 d
Finland		10 Oct 1968 a
France	11 Sep 1952	23 Jun 1954
Gabon		27 Apr 1964 a
Gambia		7 Sep 1966 d
Georgia		9 Aug 1999 a
Germany[5,6]	19 Nov 1951	1 Dec 1953
Ghana		18 Mar 1963 a
Greece	10 Apr 1952	5 Apr 1960
Guatemala		22 Sep 1983 a
Guinea		28 Dec 1965 d
Guinea-Bissau		11 Feb 1976 a
Haiti		25 Sep 1984 a
Holy See	21 May 1952	15 Mar 1956
Honduras		23 Mar 1992 a
Hungary		14 Mar 1989 a
Iceland		30 Nov 1955 a
Iran (Islamic Republic		28 Jul 1976 a

Participant	*Signature*	*Accession(a), Succession(d), Ratification*
of)		
Ireland		29 Nov 1956 a
Israel	1 Aug 1951	1 Oct 1954
Italy	23 Jul 1952	15 Nov 1954
Jamaica		30 Jul 1964 d
Japan		3 Oct 1981 a
Kazakhstan		15 Jan 1999 a
Kenya		16 May 1966 a
Kyrgyzstan		8 Oct 1996 a
Latvia		31 Jul 1997 a
Lesotho		14 May 1981 a
Liberia		15 Oct 1964 a
Liechtenstein	28 Jul 1951	8 Mar 1957
Lithuania		28 Apr 1997 a
Luxembourg	28 Jul 1951	23 Jul 1953
Madagascar		18 Dec 1967 a
Malawi		10 Dec 1987 a
Mali		2 Feb 1973 d
Malta		17 Jun 1971 a
Mauritania		5 May 1987 a
Mexico		7 Jun 2000 a
Monaco		18 May 1954 a
Montenegro		10 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		7 Nov 1956 d
Mozambique		16 Dec 1983 a
Namibia		17 Feb 1995 a
Netherlands	28 Jul 1951	3 May 1956
New Zealand		30 Jun 1960 a
Nicaragua		28 Mar 1980 a
Niger		25 Aug 1961 d
Nigeria		23 Oct 1967 a
Norway	28 Jul 1951	23 Mar 1953
Panama		2 Aug 1978 a
Papua New Guinea		17 Jul 1986 a
Paraguay		1 Apr 1970 a
Peru		21 Dec 1964 a
Philippines		22 Jul 1981 a
Poland		27 Sep 1991 a
Portugal[3]		22 Dec 1960 a
Republic of Korea		3 Dec 1992 a
Republic of Moldova		31 Jan 2002 a
Romania		7 Aug 1991 a
Russian Federation		2 Feb 1993 a

Participant	*Signature*	*Accession(a), Succession(d), Ratification*
Rwanda		3 Jan 1980 a
Samoa		21 Sep 1988 a
Sao Tome and Principe		1 Feb 1978 a
Senegal		2 May 1963 d
Serbia[2]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		23 Apr 1980 a
Sierra Leone		22 May 1981 a
Slovakia[4]		4 Feb 1993 d
Slovenia[2]		6 Jul 1992 d
Solomon Islands		28 Feb 1995 a
Somalia		10 Oct 1978 a
South Africa		12 Jan 1996 a
Spain		14 Aug 1978 a
St. Kitts and Nevis		1 Feb 2002 a
St. Vincent and the Grenadines		3 Nov 1993 a
Sudan		22 Feb 1974 a
Suriname[7]		29 Nov 1978 d
Swaziland		14 Feb 2000 a
Sweden	28 Jul 1951	26 Oct 1954
Switzerland	28 Jul 1951	21 Jan 1955
Tajikistan		7 Dec 1993 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[2]		18 Jan 1994 d
Timor-Leste		7 May 2003 a
Togo		27 Feb 1962 d
Trinidad and Tobago		10 Nov 2000 a
Tunisia		24 Oct 1957 d
Turkey	24 Aug 1951	30 Mar 1962
Turkmenistan		2 Mar 1998 a
Tuvalu[8]		7 Mar 1986 d
Uganda		27 Sep 1976 a
Ukraine[9]		10 Jun 2002 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	28 Jul 1951	11 Mar 1954
United Republic of Tanzania		12 May 1964 a
Uruguay		22 Sep 1970 a
Yemen[10]		18 Jan 1980 a
Zambia		24 Sep 1969 d
Zimbabwe		25 Aug 1981 a

Declarations under section B of article 1 of the Convention (Unless otherwise indicated in a footnote, the declarations were received upon ratification, accession or succession.) (a) "Events occurring in Europe before 1 January 1951"

Participant

Congo
Madagascar
Monaco
Turkey

(b) "Events occurring in Europe or elsewhere before 1 January 1951"

Participant

Afghanistan
Albania
Algeria
Antigua and Barbuda
Argentina[11,12]
Armenia
Australia[12]
Austria
Azerbaijan
Bahamas
Belarus
Belgium
Belize
Benin[12]
Bolivia
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]
Botswana[13]
Brazil[12]
Bulgaria
Burkina Faso
Burundi
Cameroon[12]
Canada
Central African Republic[12]
Chad
Chile[12]
Colombia[11,12]
Costa Rica
Côte d'Ivoire[12]
Croatia[2]
Cyprus

Participant

Czech Republic[4]
Democratic Republic of the Congo
Denmark
Djibouti
Dominica
Dominican Republic
Ecuador[12]
Egypt
El Salvador
Equatorial Guinea
Estonia
Ethiopia
Fiji
Finland
France[12]
Gabon
Gambia
Georgia
Germany[6]
Ghana
Greece
Guatemala
Guinea
Guinea-Bissau
Haiti
Holy See[12]
Honduras
Hungary[11,12]
Iceland
Iran (Islamic Republic of)[12]
Ireland
Israel
Italy[12]
Jamaica
Japan
Kazakhstan
Kenya
Kyrgyzstan
Latvia[11,12]
Lesotho
Liberia
Liechtenstein
Lithuania
Luxembourg[12]
Malawi[14]
Mali

Participant

Malta[12]
Mauritania
Mexico
Moldova
Montenegro
Morocco
Mozambique
Namibia
Netherlands
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Niger[12]
Nigeria
Norway
Panama
Papua New Guinea
Paraguay[11,12]
Peru[12]
Philippines
Portugal[12]
Republic of Korea
Romania
Russian Federation
Rwanda
Samoa
Sao Tome and Principe
Senegal[12]
Serbia[2]
Seychelles
Sierra Leone
Slovakia[4]
Slovenia[2]
Solomon Islands
Somalia
South Africa
Spain
St. Kitts and Nevis
St. Vincent and the Grenadines
Sudan[12]
Suriname
Swaziland
Sweden
Switzerland
Tajikistan
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[2]

Participant

Timor-Leste
Togo[12]
Trinidad and Tobago
Tunisia
Turkmenistan
Tuvalu
Uganda
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
United Republic of Tanzania
Uruguay
Yemen[10]
Zambia
Zimbabwe

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ANGOLA

The Government of the People's Republic of Angola also declares that the provisions of the Convention shall be applicable in Angola provided that they are not contrary to or incompatible with the constitutional and legal provisions in force in the People's Republic of Angola, especially as regards articles 7, 13, 15, 18 and 24 of the Convention. Those provisions shall not be construed so as to accord to any category of aliens resident in Angola more extensive rights than are enjoyed by Angolan citizens.

The Government of the People's Republic of Angola also considers that the provisions of articles 8 and 9 of the Convention cannot be construed so as to limit its right to adopt in respect of a refugee or group of refugees such measures as it deems necessary to safeguard national interests and to ensure respect for its sovereignty, whenever circumstances so require.

In addition, the Government of the People's Republic of Angola wishes to make the following reservations:

Ad article 17: The Government of the People's Republic of Angola accepts the obligations set forth in article 17, provided that:

(a) Paragraph 1 of this article shall not be interpreted to mean that refugees must enjoy the same privileges as may be accorded to nationals of countries with which the People's Republic of Angola has signed special co-operation agreements;

(b) Paragraph 2 of this article shall be construed as a recommendation and not as an obligation.

Ad article 26:

The Government of the People's Republic of Angola reserves the right to prescribe, transfer or circumscribe the place of residence of certain refugees or groups of refugees, and to restrict their freedom of movement, whenever considerations of national or international order make it advisable to do so.

AUSTRALIA[15]

AUSTRIA[16]

The Convention is ratified:

(a) Subject to the reservation that the Republic of Austria regards the provisions of article 17, paragraphs 1 and 2 (excepting, however, the phrase "who was already exempt from them at the date of entry into force of this Convention for the Contracting State concerned, or . . ." in the latter paragraph) not as a binding obligation, but merely as a recommendation.

(b) Subject to the reservation that the provisions of article 22, paragraph 1, shall not be applicable to the establishment and maintenance of private elementary schools, that the "public relief and assistance" referred to in article 23 shall be interpreted solely in the sense of allocations from public welfare funds (*Armenversorgung)* , and that the "documents or certifications" referred to in article 25, paragraphs 2 and 3 shall be construed to mean the identity certificates provided for in the Convention of 30 June 1928 relating to refugees.

BAHAMAS

Reservation:

"Refugees and their dependants would normally be subjected to the same laws and regulations relating generally to the employment of non-Bahamians within the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, so long as they have not acquired status in the Commonwealth of the Bahamas."

BELGIUM

1. In all cases where the Convention grants to refugees the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country, this provision shall not be interpreted by the Belgian Government as necessarily involving the régime accorded to nationals of countries with which Belgium has concluded regional customs, economic or political agreements.

2. Article 15 of the Convention shall not be applicable in Belgium; refugees lawfully staying in Belgian territory will enjoy the same treatment, as regards the right of association, as that accorded to aliens in general.

BOTSWANA

"Subject to the reservation of articles 7, 17, 26, 31, 32 and 34 and paragraph 1 of article 12 of the Convention."

BRAZIL[17]

7 April 1972

"Refugees will be granted the same treatment accorded to nationals of foreign countries in general, with the exception of the preferential treatment extended to nationals of Portugal through the Friendship and Consultation Treaty of 1953 and Article 199 of the Brazilian Constitutional Amendment No.1, of 1969."

CANADA

"Subject to the following reservation with reference to Articles 23 and 24 of the Convention:

"Canada interprets the phrase `lawfully staying' as referring only to refugees admitted for permanent residence: refugees admitted for temporary residence will be accorded the same treatment with respect to the matters dealt with in articles 23 and 24 as is accorded visitors generally."

CHILE

(1) With the reservation that, with reference to the provisions of article 34, the Government of Chile will be unable to grant to refugees facilities greater that those granted to aliens in general, in view of the liberal nature of Chilean naturalization laws;

(2) With the reservation that the period specified in article 17, paragraph 2 (a) shall, in the case of Chile, be extended from three to ten years;

(3) With the reservation that article 17, paragraph 2 (c) shall apply only if the refugee is the widow or the widower of a Chilean spouse;

(4) With the reservation that the Government of Chile cannot grant a longer period for compliance with an expulsion order than that granted to other aliens in general under Chilean law.

CHINA

"[Subject to] reservations on the following articles:

(1). The latter half of article 14, which reads

'In the territory of any other Contracting State, he shall be accorded the same protection as is accorded in that territory to nationals of the country in which he has his habitual residence.'

(2). Article 16 (3)."

CYPRUS[18]

With confirmation of the reservations made by the Government of the United Kingdom upon application of the Convention to the territory of Cyprus.

DENMARK[19]

25 March 1968

"[Subject to] the following reservation:

The obligation in article 17, paragraph 1, to accord to refugees lawfully staying in Denmark the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country as regards the right to engage in wage-earning employment shall not be construed to mean that refugees shall be entitled to the privileges which in this respect are accorded to nationals of Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden."

ECUADOR

[Subject to] the following declarations and reservation:

With respect to article 1, relating to the definition of the term "refugee", the Government of Ecuador declares that its accession to the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees does not imply its acceptance of the Conventions which have not been expressly signed and ratified by Ecuador.

With respect to article 15, Ecuador further declares that its acceptance of the provisions contained therein shall be limited in so far as those provisions are in conflict with the constitutional and statutory provisions in force prohibiting aliens, and consequently refugees, from being members of political bodies.

EGYPT

With reservations in respect of article 12 (1), articles 20 and 22 (1), and articles 23 and 24.

Clarifications (received on 24 September 1981):

1. Egypt formulated a reservation to article 12 (1) because it is in contradiction with the internal laws of Egypt. This article provides that the personal status of a refugee shall be governed by the law of the country of his domicile or, failing this, of his residence. This formula contradicts article 25 of the Egyptian civil code, which reads as follows:

"The judge declares the applicable law in the case of persons without nationality or with more than one nationality at the same time. In the case of persons where there is proof, in accordance with Egypt, of Egyptian nationality, and at the same time in accordance with one or more foreign countries, of nationality of that country, the Egyptian law must be applied."

The competent Egyptian authorities are not in a position to amend this article (25) of the civil code.

2. Concerning articles 20, 22 (paragraph 1), 23 and 24 of the Convention of 1951, the competent Egyptian authorities had reservations because these articles consider the refugee as equal to the national.

We made this general reservation to avoid any obstacle which might affect the discretionary authority of Egypt in granting privileges to refugees on a case-by-case basis.

ESTONIA

"[Subject to the following] reservations ...:

1) to Articles 23 and 24 as follows:

The Republic of Estonia considers articles 23 and 24 merely as recommendatory, not as legally binding.

2) to Article 25 as follows:

The Republic of Estonia shall not be bound to cause a certificate to be delivered by an Estonian authority, in place of the authorities of a foreign country, if documentary records necessary for the delivery of such a certificate do not exist in the Republic of Estonia.

3) to Article 28, paragraph 1 as follows:

The Republic of Estonia shall not be obliged within five years from the entry into force of the present Convention to issue travel documents provided in article 28."

ETHIOPIA

"[S]ubject to the following reservations made under the terms of Article 42, paragraph 1, of the Convention and Article VII, paragraph 1, of the Protocol :

The provisions of articles 8, 9, 17 (2) and 22 (1) of the Convention are recognized only as recommendations and not as legally binding obligations."

FIJI

The Government of Fiji stated that "...[t]he first and fourth reservations made by the United Kingdom are affirmed but have been redrafted as more suitable to the application of Fiji in the following terms:

1. The Government of Fiji understands articles 8 and 9 as not preventing them from taking in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances measures in the interests of national security in the case of a refugee on the ground of his nationality. The provisions of article 8 shall not prevent the Government of Fiji from exercising any rights over property and interests which they may acquire or have acquired as an Allied or Associated Power under a Treaty of Peace or other agreement or arrangement for the restoration of peace which has been or may be completed as a result of the Second World War. Furthermore the provisions of article 8 shall not affect the treatment to be accorded to any property or interests which at the date of entry into force of this Convention on behalf of Fiji were under the control of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland or of the Government of Fiji respectively by reason of a state of war which existed between them and any other State.

2. The Government of Fiji cannot undertake to give effect to the obligations contained in paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 25 and can only undertake to apply the provisions of paragraph 3 so far as the law allows.

Commentary:

No arrangements exist in Fiji for the administrative assistance for which provision is made in article 25 nor have any such arrangements been found necessary in the case of refugees. Any need for the documents or certifications mentioned in paragraph 2 of that article would be met by affidavits...

All other reservations made by the United Kingdom to the above-mentioned [Convention are] withdrawn."

FINLAND[20]

"[S]ubject to the following reservations:

(1) A general reservation to the effect that the application of those provisions of the Convention which grant to refugees the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country shall not be affected by the fact that special rights and privileges are now or may in future be accorded by Finland to the nationals of Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden or to the nationals of any one of those Countries;

[...]

(5) A reservation to article 24, paragraph 1 (b) and paragraph 3 to the effect that they shall not be binding on Finland;

[...]

FRANCE

In depositing its instrument of ratification, the Government of the French Republic, acting in accordance with article 42 of the Convention, makes the following statements:

(a) It considers that article 29, paragraph 2, does not prevent the application in French territory of the provisions of the Act of 7 May 1934 authorizing the levying of the Nansen tax for the support of refugee welfare, resettlement and relief work.

(b) Article 17 in no way prevents the application of the laws and regulations establishing the proportion of alien workers that employers are authorized to employ in France or affects the obligations of such employers in connexion with the employment of alien workers.

GAMBIA[21]

GEORGIA

"According to the paragraph 1, article 40 of the [...] Convention, before the full restoration of the territorial integrity of Georgia, this Convention is applicable only to the territory where the jurisdiction of Georgia is exercised."

GREECE[22]

"In cases or circumstances which, in its opinion, would justify exceptional procedure for reasons of national security or public order, the Hellenic Government *reserves* the right to derogate from the obligations imposed by the provisions of article 26."

GUATEMALA[23]

HOLY SEE

The Holy See, in conformity with the terms of article 42, paragraph 1, of the Convention, makes the reservation that the application of the Convention must be compatible in practice with the special nature of the Vatican City State and without prejudice to the norms governing access to and sojourn therein.

HONDURAS

Reservations:

(a) With respect to article 7:

The Government of the Republic of Honduras understands this article to mean that it shall accord to refugees such facilities and treatment as it shall deem appropriate at its discretion, taking into account the economic, social, democratic and security needs of the country;

(b) With respect to article 17:

This article shall in no way be understood as limiting the application of the labour and civil service laws of the country, especially is so far as they refer to the requirements, quotas and conditions of work which an alien must fulfil in his employment;

(c) With respect to article 24:

The Government of Honduras shall apply this article to the extent that it does not violate constitutional provisions governing labour, administrative or social security legislation in force in the country;

(d) With respect to articles 26 and 31:

The Government of Honduras reserves the right to designate, change or limit the place of residence of certain refugees or groups of refugees and to restrict their freedom of movement when national or international considerations so warrant;

(e) With respect to article 34:

The Government of the Republic of Honduras shall not be obligated to guarantee refugees more favourable naturalization facilities than those ordinarily granted to aliens in accordance with the laws of the country.

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Subject to the following reservations:

1. In all cases where, under the provisions of this Convention, refugees enjoy the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign State, the Government of Iran reserves the right not to accord refugees the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of States with which Iran has concluded regional establishment, customs, economic or political agreements.

2. The Government of Iran considers the stipulations contained in articles 17, 23, 24 and 26 as being recommendations only.

IRELAND[24]

"[S]ubject to the following declarations and reservations:

...

2. The Government of Ireland understands the words `public order' in article 32 (1) and the words `in accordance with due process of law' in article 32 (2) to mean, respectively, `public policy' and `in accordance with a procedure provided by law'.

3. With regard to article 17 the Government of Ireland do not undertake to grant to refugees rights of wage-earning employment more favourable than those granted to aliens generally.

4. The Government of Ireland undertake to give effect to article 25 only insofar as may be practicable and permissible under the laws of Ireland.

5. With regard to article 29 (1) the Government of Ireland do not undertake to accord to refugees treatment more favourable than that accorded to aliens generally with respect to

. . .

(c) Income Tax (including Surtax)."

ISRAEL

"[S]ubject to the following statements and reservations:

...

2. Articles 8 and 12 shall not apply to Israel.

3. Article 28 shall apply to Israel with the limitations which result from Section 6 of the Passport Law of 5712-1952, according to which the Minister may, at his discretion:

(a) Refuse to grant, or to extend the validity of a passport or laissez-passer;

(b) Attach conditions to the grant or the extension of the validity of a passport or laissez-passer;

(c) Cancel, or shorten the period of validity of a passport or laissez-passer issued, and order the surrender thereof;

(d) Limit, either at or after the issue of a passport or laissez-passer, the range of countries for which it is to be valid.

4. Permits provided for by Article 30 shall be issued by the Minister of Finance at his discretion."

ITALY[25]

JAMAICA

"The Government of Jamaica confirms and maintains the following reservations, which were made when the Convention was extended to Jamaica by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

(i) The Government of the United Kingdom understand articles 8 and 9 as not preventing the taking by the above-mentioned territory, in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances, of measures in the interests of national security in the case of a refugee on the ground of his nationality. The provisions of article 8 shall not prevent the Government of the United Kingdom from exercising any rights over property or interests which they may acquire or have acquired as an Allied or Associated Power under a Treaty of Peace or other agreement or arrangement for the restoration of peace which has been or may be completed as a result of the Second World War. Furthermore, the provisions of article 8 shall not affect the treatment to be accorded to any property or interests which, at the date of entry into force of the Convention for the above-mentioned territory, are under the control of the Government of the United Kingdom by reason of a state of war which exists or existed between them and any other State.

(ii) The Government of the United Kingdom accept paragraph 2 of article 17 in its application to the above-mentioned territory with the substitution of `four years' for `three years' in subparagraph (a) and with the omission of subparagraph (c).

(iii) The Government of the United Kingdom can only undertake that the provisions of subparagraph (b) of paragraph 1 of article 24 and of paragraph 2 of that article will be applied to the above-mentioned territory so far as the law allows.

(iv) The Government of the United Kingdom cannot undertake that effect will be given in the above-mentioned territory to paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 25 and can only undertake that the provisions of paragraph 3 will be applied in the above-mentioned territory so far as the law alows."

LATVIA

"Reservation

In accordance with paragraph 1 of article 42 of the [said Convention], the Republic of Latvia declares that it does not consider itself bound by the article 8 and the article 34 of the Convention.

Reservation

In accordance with paragraph 1 of the article 42 of the [said Convention], the Republic of Latvia, in respect of the article 26 of the Convention, reserves the right to designate the place or places of residence of the refugees whenever considerations of national security or public order so require.

Reservation

In accordance with paragraph 1of the article 42 of the [said Convention], the Republic of Latvia declares that the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of the article 17 and article 24 of the Convention it considers as recommendations and not legal obligations.

Reservation

In accordance with paragraph 1 of the article 42 of the [said Convention], the Republic of Latvia declares that in all cases where the Convention grants to refugees the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country, this provision shall not be interpreted by the Government of the Republic of Latvia as necessarily involving the regime accorded to nationals of countries with which the Republic of Latvia had concluded regional customs, economic, political or social security agreements."

LIECHTENSTEIN

Subject to the following reservations:

Ad article 17: With respect to the right to engage in wage-earning employment, refugees are treated in law on the same footing as aliens in general, on the understanding, however, that the competent authorities shall make every effort insofar as possible, to apply to them the provisions of this article.

Ad article 24, paragraphs 1 (a) and (b), and paragraph 3: Provisions relating to aliens in general on training, apprenticeship, unemployment insurance, old-age and survivors insurance shall be applicable to refugees. Nevertheless, in the case of old-age and survivors insurance, refugees residing in Liechtenstein (including their survivors if the latter are considered as refugees) are already entitled to normal old-age or survivors' benefits after paying their contributions for at least one full year, provided that they have resided in Liechtenstein for ten years–of which five years without interruption have immediately preceded the occurrence of the event insured against. Moreover, the one-third reduction in benefits provided in the case of aliens and stateless persons under article 74 of the Act on Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, is not applicable to refugees. Refugees residing in Liechtenstein who, on the occurrence of the event insured against, are not entitled to old-age or survivors' benefits, are paid not only their own contributions but any contributions which may have been made by the employers.

LUXEMBOURG

Upon signature:

Subject to the following reservation: in all cases where this Convention grants to refugees the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country, this provision shall not be interpreted as necessarily involving the régime accorded to nationals of countries with which the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg has concluded regional, customs, economic or political agreements.

15 November 1984

Interpretative statement:

The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg considers that the reservation made by the Republic of Guatemala concerning the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees of 28 July 1951 and the Protocol relating to the Status of Refugee of 31 January 1967 does not affect the obligations of Guatemala deriving from those instruments.

MADAGASCAR

The provisions of article 7 (1) shall not be interpreted as requiring the same treatment as is accorded to nationals of countries with which the Malagasy Republic has concluded conventions of establishment or agreements on co-operation;

The provisions of articles 8 and 9 shall not be interpreted as forbidding the Malagasy Government to take, in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances, measures with regard to a refugee because of his nationality in the interests of national security.

The provisions of article 17 cannot be interpreted as preventing the application of the laws and regulations establishing the proportion of alien workers that employers are authorized to employ in Madagascar or affecting the obligations of such employers in connexion with the employment of alien workers.

MALAWI

"In respect of articles 7, 13, 15, 19, 22 and 24

The Government of the Republic of Malawi considers these provisions as recommendations only and not legally binding ob ligations.

In respect of article 17

The Government of the Republic of Malawi does not consider itself bound to grant a refugee who fulfils any of the conditions set forth in subparagraphs (a) to (c) to paragraph (2) of article 17 automatic exemption for the obligation to obtain a work permit.

In respect of article 17 as a whole, the Government of the Republic of Malawi does not undertake to grant to refugees rights of wage earning employment more favourable than those granted to aliens generally.

In respect of article 26

The Government of the Republic of Malawi reserves its right to designate the place or places of residence of the refugees and to restrict their movements whenever considerations of national security or public order so require.

In respect of article 34

The Government of the Republic of Malawi is not bound to grant to refugees any more favourable naturalization facilities than are granted, in accordance with the relevant laws and regulations, to aliens generally."

MALTA[26]

MEXICO

Interpretative declarations:

It will always be the task of the Government of Mexico to determine and grant, in accordance with its legal provisions in force, refugee status, without prejudice to the definition of a refugee provided for under article 1 of the Convention and article 1 of its Protocol.

The Government of Mexico has the power to grant refugees greater facilities for naturalization and assimilation than those accorded to aliens in general, within the framework of its population policy and, particularly, with regard to refugees, in accordance with its national legislation.

Reservations:

The Government of Mexico is convinced of the importance of ensuring that all refugees can obtain wage-earning employment as a means of subsistence and affirms that refugees will be treated, in accordance with the law, under the same conditions as aliens in general, including the laws and regulations which establish the proportion of alien workers that employers are authorized to employ in Mexico, and this will not affect the obligations of employers with regard to the employment of alien workers.

On the other hand, since the Government of Mexico is unable to guarantee refugees who meet any of the requirements referred to in article 17, paragraph 2 (a), (b) and (c), of the Convention, the automatic extension of the obligations for obtaining a work permit, it lodges an express reservation to these provisions.

The Government of Mexico reserves the right to assign, in accordance with its national legislation, the place or places of residence of refugees and to establish the conditions for moving within the national territory, for which reason it lodges an express reservation to articles 26 and 31 (2) of the Convention.

The Government of Mexico lodges an express reservation to article 32 of the Convention and, therefore refers to the application of article 33 of the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States, without prejudice to observanc of the principle of non-refoulement set forth in article 33 of the Convention.

MONACO

Subject to the reservation that the stipulations contained in articles 7 (paragraph 2), 15, 22 (paragraph 1), 23 and 24 shall be provisionally considered as being recommendations and not legal obligations.

MOZAMBIQUE

Reservations:

In respect of articles 13 and 22:

The Government of Mozambique will take these provisions as simple recommendations not binding it to accord to refugees the same treatment as is accorded to Mozambicans with respect to elementary education and property.

In respect of articles 17 and 19:

The Government of Mozambique will interpret [these provisions] to the effect that it is not required to grant privileges from obligation to obtain a work permit.

As regards article 15:

The Government of Mozambique will not be bound to accord to refugees or groups of refugees resident in its territory more extensive rights than those enjoyed by nationals with respect to the right of association and it reserves the right to restrict them in the interest of national security.

As regards article 26:

The Government of Mozambique reserves its right to designate place or places for principal residence for refugees or to restrict their freedom of movement whenever considerations of national security make it advisable.

As regards article 34:

The Government of Mozambique does not consider itself bound to grant to refugees facilities greater than those granted to other categories of aliens in general, with respect to naturalization laws."

NAMIBIA

"[S]ubject to the following reservation in respect of article 26:

The Government of the Republic of Namibia reserves the right to designate a place or places for principal reception and residence for refugees or to restrict their freedom of movement if consideration of national security so required or make it advisable."

NETHERLANDS

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

This signature is appended subject to the reservation that in all cases where this Convention grants to refugees the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country this provision shall not be interpreted as involving the régime accorded to nationals of countries with which the Netherlands has concluded regional, customs, economic or political agreements.

Declarations:

(1) With reference to article 26 of this Convention, the Netherlands Government reserves the right to designate a place of principal residence for certain refugees or groups of refugees in the public interest.

(2) In the notifications concerning overseas territories referred to in article 40, paragraph 2, of this Convention, the Netherlands Government reserves the right to make a declaration in accordance with section B of article 1 with respect to such territories and to make reservations in accordance with article 42 of the Convention.

Interpretative declaration:

In depositing the instrument of ratification by the Netherlands, . . . I declare on behalf of the Netherlands Government that it does not regard the Amboinese who were transported to the Netherlands after 27 December 1949, the date of the transfer of sovereignty by the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the Republic of the United States of Indonesia, as eligible for the status of refugees as defined in article 1 of the said Convention.

NEW ZEALAND

"The Government of New Zealand can only undertake to give effect to the provisions contained in paragraph 2 of article 24 of the Convention so far as the law of New Zealand allows."

NORWAY[27]

"The obligation stipulated in article 17 (1) to accord to refugees lawfully staying in the country the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country in the same circumstances as regards the right to engage in wage-earning employment, shall not be construed as extending to refugees the benefits of agreements which may in the future be concluded between Norway, Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Sweden, or between Norway and any one of these countries, for the purpose of establishing special conditions for the transfer of labour between these countries."

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

"The Government of Papua New Guinea in accordance with article 42 paragraph 1 of the Convention makes a reservation with respect to the provisions contained in articles 17 (1), 21, 22 (1), 26, 31, 32 and 34 of the Convention and does not accept the obligations stipulated in these articles."

POLAND

The Republic of Poland does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 24, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

PORTUGAL[28]

13 July 1976

"In all cases in which the Convention confers upon the refugees the most favoured person status granted to nationals of a foreign country, this clause will not be interpreted in such a way as to mean the status granted by Portugal to the nationals of Brazil."

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

"The Republic of Korea declares pursuant to article 42 of the Convention that it is not bound by article 7 which provides for the exemption of refugees from legislative reciprocity after fulfilling the condition of three years' residence in the territory of the Contracting States."

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

Declarations and reservations:

" ... with the following declarations and reservations:

1. According to paragraph 1, article 40 of the Convention, the Republic of Moldova declares that, until the full restoration of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova, the provisions of this Convention are applicable only in the territory where the jurisdiction of the Republic of Moldova is exercised.
2. The Republic of Moldova shall apply the provisions of this convention with no discrimination generally not only as to race, religion or country of origin as stipulated in Article 3 of the Convention.
3. For the purposes of this Convention by the notion "residence"shall be understood the permanent and lawful domicile.
4. According to paragraph 1 of Article 42 of the Convention, the Republic of Moldova reserves the right that the provisions of the Convention, according to which refugees shall be accorded treatment not less favorable than hat accorded aliens generally, are not interpreted as an obligation to offer refugees a regime similar to that accorded to the citizens of the states with which the Republic of Moldova has signed regional customs, economic, political and social security treaties.
5. According to paragraph 1 of Article 42 of the Convention, the Republic of Moldova reserves the right to consider the provisions of Article 13 as recommendations and not as obligations.
6. According to paragraph 1 of Article 42 of the Convention, the Republic of Moldova reserves the right to consider the provisions of Article 17 (2) as recommendations and not as obligations.
7. According to paragraph 1 of Article 42 of the Convention, the Republic of Moldova interprets the provisions of Article 21 of the Convention as not obliged to accord housing to refugees.
8. The Government of the Republic of Moldova reserves the right to apply the provisions of Article 24 so that they do not infringe upon the constitutional and

domestic legislation provisions rerding the right to labor and social protection.

9. According to paragraph 1 of Article 42 of the Convention, in implementing Article 26 of this Convention, the Republic of Moldova reserves the right to establish the place of residence for certain refugees or groups of refugees in the interest of the state and society.

10. The Republic of Moldova shall apply the provisions of Article 31 of the Convention as of the date of the entry into force of the Law on Refugee Status.

RWANDA

Reservation to article 26:

For reasons of public policy (*ordre public*), the Rwandese Republic reserves the right to determine the place of residence of refugees and to establish limits to their freedom of movement.

SIERRA LEONE

"The Government of Sierra Leone wishes to state with regard to article 17 (2) that Sierra Leone does not consider itself bound to grant to refugees the rights stipulated therein.

Further, with regard to article 17 as a whole, the Government of Sierra Leone wishes to state that it considers the article to be a recommendation only and not a binding obligation.

The Government of Sierra Leone wishes to state that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 29, and it reserves the right to impose special taxes on aliens as provided for in the Constitution."

SOMALIA

"[Subject to] the following declaration:

The Government of the Somali Democratic Republic acceded to the Convention and Protocol on the understanding that nothing in the said Convention or Protocol will be construed to prejudice or adversely affect the national status, or political aspiration of displaced people from Somali Territories under alien domination.

It is in this spirit, that the Somali Democratic Republic will commit itself to respect the terms and provisions of the said Convention and Protocol."

SPAIN

(a) The expression "the most favourable treatment" shall, in all the articles in which it is used, be interpreted as not including rights which, by law or by treaty, are granted to nationals of Portugal, Andorra, the Philippines or the Latin American countries or to nationals of countries with which international agreements of a regional nature are concluded.

(b) The Government of Spain considers that article 8 is not a binding rule but a recommendation.

(c) The Government of Spain reserves its position on the application of article 12, paragraph 1. Article 12, paragraph 2, shall be interpreted as referring exclusively to rights acquired by a refugee before he obtained, in any country, the status of refugee.

(d) Article 26 of the Convention shall be interpreted as not precluding the adoption of special measures concerning the place of residence of particular refugees, in accordance with Spanish law.

SUDAN

With reservation as to article 26.

SWEDEN[29]

With the following reservations:

First , a general reservation to the effect that the application of those provisions of the Convention which grant to refugees the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country shall not be affected by the fact that special rights and privileges are now or may in future be accorded by Sweden to the nationals of Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Norway or to the nationals of any one of those countries; and, *secondly* , the following reservations: a reservation to article 8 to the effect that that article shall not be binding on Sweden; a reservation to article 12, paragraph 1, to the effect that the Convention shall not modify the rule of Swedish private international law, as now in force, under which the personal status of a refugee is governed by the law of his country of nationality . . .; a reservation to article 17, paragraph 2, to the effect that Sweden does not consider itself bound to grant a refugee who fulfils any one of the conditions set out in subparagraphs (a)-(c) an automatic exemption from the obligation to obtain a work permit; a reservation to article 24, paragraph 1 (b), to the effect that notwithstanding the principle of national treatment for refugees, Sweden shall not be bound to accord to refugees the same treatment as is accorded to nationals in respect of the possibility of entitlement to a national pension under the provisions of the National Insurance Act; and likewise to the effect that, in so far as the right to a supplementary pension under the said Act and the computation of such pension in certain respects are concerned, the rules applicable to Swedish nationals shall be more favourable than those applied to other insured persons; a reservation to article 24, paragraph 3, to the effect that the provisions of this paragraph shall not be binding on Sweden; and a reservation to article 25, to the effect that Sweden does not consider itself bound to cause a certificate to be delivered by a Swedish authority, in the place of the authorities of a foreign country, if the documentary records necessary for the delivery of such a certificate do not exist in Sweden.

SWITZERLAND[30]

TIMOR-LESTE

Declaration:

"In conformity with Article 42 of the Covention, the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste accedes to the Convention with reservations in respect of Articles 16 (2), 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24."

TURKEY

Upon signature:

The Turkish Government considers moreover, that the term "events occurring before 1 January 1951" refers to the beginning of the events. Consequently, since the pressure exerted upon the Turkish minority in Bulgaria, which began before 1 January 1951, is still continuing, the provision of this Convention must also apply to the Bulgarian refugees of Turkish extraction compelled to leave that country as a result of this pressure and who, being unable to enter Turkey, might seek refuge on the territory of another contracting party after 1 January 1951.

The Turkish Government will, at the time of ratification, enter reservations which it could make under article 42 of the Convention.

Reservation and declaration made upon ratification:

No provision of this Convention may be interpreted as granting to refugees greater rights than those accorded to Turkish citizens in Turkey;

The Government of the Republic of Turkey is not a party to the Arrangements of 12 May 1926 and of 30 June 1928 mentioned in article 1, paragraph A, of this Convention. Furthermore, the 150 persons affected by the Arrangement of 30 June 1928 having been amnestied under Act No.3527, the provisions laid down in this

Arrangement are no longer valid in the case of Turkey. Consequently, the Government of the Republic of Turkey considers the Convention of 28 July 1951 independently of the aforementioned Arrangements . . .

The Government of the Republic understands that the action of "re-availment" or "reacquisition" as referred to in article 1, paragraph C, of the Convention–that is to say: "If (1) He has voluntarily re-availed himself of the protection of the country of his nationality; or (2) Having lost his nationality, he has voluntarily reacquired it"–does not depend only on the request of the person concerned but also on the consent of the State in question.

UGANDA

"(1) *In respect of article 7:* The Government of the Republic of Uganda understands this provision as not conferring any legal, political or other enforceable right upon refugees who, at any given time, may be in Uganda. On the basis of this understanding the Government of the Republic of Uganda shall accord refugees such facilities and treatment as the Government of the Republic of Uganda shall in her absolute discretion, deem fit having regard to her own security, economic and social needs.

(2) *In respect of articles 8 and 9:* The Government of the Republic of Uganda declares that the provisions of articles 8 and 9 are recognized by it as recommendations only.

(3) *In respect of article 13:* The Government of the Republic of Uganda reserves to itself the right to abridge this provision without recourse to courts of law or arbitral tribunals, national or international, if the Government of the Republic of Uganda deems such abridgement to be in the public interest.

(4) *In respect of article 15:* The Government of the Republic of Uganda shall in the public interest have the full freedom to withhold any or all rights conferred by this article from any refugees as a class of residents within her territory.

(5) *In respect of article 16:* The Government of the Republic of Uganda understands article 16 paragraphs 2 and 3 thereof as not requiring the Government of the Republic of Uganda to accord to a refugee in need of legal assistance, treatment more favourable than that extended to aliens generally in similar circumstances.

(6) *In respect of article 17:* The obligation specified in article 17 to accord to refugees lawfully staying in the country in the same circumstances shall not be construed as extending to refugees the benefit of preferential treatment granted to nationals of the states who enjoy special privileges on account of existing or future treaties between Uganda and those countries, particularly sttes of the East African Community and the Organization of African Unity, in accordance with the provisions which govern such charters in this respect.

(7) *In respect of article 25:* The Government of the Republic of Uganda understands that this article shall not require the Government of the Republic of Uganda to incur expenses on behalf of the refugees in connection with the granting of such assistance except in so far as such assistance is requested by and the resulting expense is reimbursed to the Government of the Republic of Uganda by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees or any other agency of the United Nations which may succeed it.

(8) *In respect of article 32:* Without recourse to legal process the Government of the Republic of Uganda shall, in the public interest, have the unfettered right to expel any refugee in her territory and may at any time apply such internal measures as the Government may deem necessary in the circumstances; so however that, any action taken by the Government of the Republic of Uganda in this regard shall not operate to the prejudice of the provisions of article 33 of this Convention."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"(i) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland understand articles 8 and 9 as not preventing them from taking in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances measures in the interests of national security in the case of a refugee on the ground of his nationality. The provisions of article 8 shall not prevent the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland from exercising any rights over property or interests which they may acquire or have acquired as an Allied or Associated power under a Treaty of Peace or other agreement or arrangement for the restoration of peace which has been or may be completed as a result of the Second World War. Furthermore, the provisions of article 8 shall not affect the treatment to be accorded to any property or interests which at the date of entry into force of this Convention for the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland are under the control of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland by reason of a state of war which exists or existed between them and any other State.

(ii) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland accept paragraph 2 of article 17 with the substitution of "four years" for "three years" in sub-paragraph (a) and with the omission of sub-paragraph (c).

(iii) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, in respect of such of the matters referred to in sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 1 of article 24 as fall within the scope of the National Health Service, can only undertake to apply the provisions of that paragraph so far as the law allows; and it can only undertake to apply the provisions of paragraph 2 of that Article so far as the law allows.

(iv) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland cannot undertake to give effect to the obligations contained in paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 25 and can only undertake to apply the provisions of paragraph 3 so far as the law allows.

Commentary

In connexion with sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 1 of article 24 relating to certain matters within the scope of the National Health Service, the National Health Service (Amendment) Act, 1949, contains powers for charges to be made to persons not ordinarily resident in Great Britain (which category would include refugees) who receive treatment under the Service. While these powers have not yet been exercised it is possible that this might have to be done at some future date. In Northern Ireland the health services are restricted to persons ordinarily resident in the country except where regulations are made to extend the Service to others. It is for these reasons that the Government of the United Kingdom while they are prepared in the future, as in the past, to give the most sympathetic consideration to the situation of refugees, find it necessary to make a reservation to sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 1 of article 24 of the Convention.

The scheme of Industrial Injuries Insurance in Great Britain does not meet the requirements of paragraph 2 of article 24 of the Convention. Where an insured person has died as the result of an industrial accident or a disease due to the nature of his employment, benefit cannot generally be paid to his dependants who are abroad unless they are in any part of the British Commonwealth, in the Irish Republic or in a country with which the United Kingdom has made a reciprocal agreement concerning the payment of industrial injury benefits. There is an exception to this rule in favour of the dependants of certain seamen who die as a result of industrial accidents happening to them while they are in the service of British ships. In this matter refugees are treated in the same way as citizens of the United Kingdom and Colonies and by reason of paragraphs 3 and 4 of article 24 of the Convention, the dependants of refugees will be able to take advantage of reciprocal agreements which provide for the payment of United Kingdom industrial injury benefits in other countries. By reason of paragraphs (3) and (4) of article 24 refugees will enjoy under the scheme of National Insurance and Industrial Injuries Insurance certain rights which are withheld from British subjects who are not citizens of the United Kingdom and Colonies.

No arrangements exist in the United Kingdom for the administrative assistance for which provision is made in article 25 nor have any such arrangements been found necessary in the case of refugees. Any need for the documents or certifications mentioned in paragraph 2 of that article would be met by affidavits."

ZAMBIA

"Subject to the following reservations made pursuant to article 42 (1) of the Convention:

Article 17 (2)

The Government of the Republic of Zambia wishes to state with regard to article 17, paragraph 2, that Zambia does not consider itself bound to grant to a refugee who fulfils any one of the conditions set out in sub-paragraphs (a) to (c) automatic exemption from the obligation to obtain a work permit.

Further, with regard to article 17 as a whole, Zambia does not wish to undertake to grant to refugees rights of wage-earning employment more favourable than those granted to aliens generally.

Article 22 (1)

The Government of the Republic of Zambia wishes to state that it considers article 22 (1) to be a recommendation only and not a binding obligation to accord to refugees the same treatment as is accorded to nationals with respect to elementary education.

Article 26

The Government of the Republic of Zambia wishes to state with regard to article 26 that it reserves the right to designate a place or places of residence for refugees.

Article 28

The Government of the Republic of Zambia wishes to state with regard to article 28 that Zambia considers itself not bound to issue a travel document with a return clause in cases where a country of second asylum has accepted or indicated its willingness to accept a refugee from Zambia."

ZIMBABWE

"1. The Government of the Republic of Zimbabwe declares that it is not bound by any of the reservations to the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, the application of which had been extended by the Government of the United Kingdom to its territory before the attainment of independence.

2. The Government of the Republic of Zimbabwe wishes to state with regard to article 17, paragraph 2, that it does not consider itself bound to grant a refugee who fulfills any of the conditions set out in subparagraphs (a) to (c) automatic exemption from the obligation to obtain a work permit. In addition, with regard to article 17 as a whole, the Republic of Zimbabwe does not undertake to grant to refugees rights of wage-earning employment more favourable than those granted to aliens generally.

3. The Government of the Republic of Zimbabwe wishes to state that it considers article 22 (1) as being a recommendation only and not an obligation to accord to refugees the same treatment as it accords to nationals with respect to elementary education.

4. The Government of the Republic of Zimbabwe considers articles 23 and 24 as being recommendations only.

5. The Government of the Republic of Zimbabwe wishes to state with regard to article 26 that it reserves the right to designate a place or places of residence for refugees."

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BELGIUM

5 November 1984

[Regarding the reservation made by Guatemala upon accession] [the Belgian Government] considers that it is impossible for the other States parties to determine the scope of a reservation which is expressed in such broad terms and which refers for the most part to domestic law, and that the reservation is thus not acceptable. It therefore voices an objection to the said reservation.

ETHIOPIA

10 January 1979

"The Provisional Military Government of Socialist Ethiopia wishes to place on record its objection to the declaration [made by Somalia upon accession] and that it does not recognize it as valid on the ground that there are no Somali territories under alien domination."

FRANCE

23 October 1984

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, as the one made by Belgium.]

GERMANY

5 December 1984

"The Federal Government views [the reservation made by Guatemala] as being worded in such general terms that its application could conceivably nullify the provisions of the Convention and the Protocol. Consequently, this reservation cannot be accepted."

GREECE[22]

ITALY

26 November 1984

[The Government of Italy] considers [the reservation made by Guatemala] to be unacceptable since the very general terms in which it is couched and the fact that it refers for the most part to domestic law and leaves it to the Guatemalan Government to decide whether to apply numerous aspects of the Convention make it impossible for other States parties to determine the scope of the reservation.

LUXEMBOURG

[For the interpretative statement by Luxembourg concerning the reservation by Guatemala, see under "Declarations other than those made under section B of article 1 and Reservations" in this chapter.]

NETHERLANDS

11 December 1984

Regarding the reservation made by Guatemala upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the opinion that a reservation phrased in such general terms and referring to the domestic law only is undesirable, since its scope is not entirely clear."

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Australia	22 Jan 1954	Nauru, Norfolk Island and Papua New Guinea
Denmark	4 Dec 1952	Greenland
France	23 Jun 1954	All territories for the international relations of which France is responsible
Netherlands[7]	29 Jul 1971	Suriname
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[8,18,21,31,32,33,34,35,36,37]	11 Mar 1954	Channel Islands and Isle of Man
	25 Oct 1956	The following territories with reservations: British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Cyprus, Dominica, Falkland Islands, Fiji, Gambia, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Jamaica, Kenya, Mauritius, St. Vincent, Seychelles, Somaliland Protectorate, Zanzibar and St. Helena
	19 Jun 1957	British Honduras
	11 Jul 1960	Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland
	11 Nov 1960	Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate and Swaziland
	4 Sep 1968	Montserrat and St. Lucia
	20 Apr 1970	Bahama Islands

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated the declarations and reservations were made upon notification of territorial application.)

DENMARK

Greenland

Subject to the reservations made on ratification by the Government of Denmark.

NETHERLANDS[7]

Surinam

The extension is subject to the following reservations, which had been made in substance by the Government of the Netherlands upon ratification:

"1. that in all cases where the Convention, in conjunction with the Protocol, grants to refugees the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country, this provision shall not be interpreted as involving the régime accorded to nationals of countries with which the Kingdom of the Netherlands has concluded regional, customs, economic or political agreements which apply to Surinam;

"2. that the Government of Surinam as regards article 26 of the Convention, in conjunction with article 1, paragraph 1, of the Protocol, reserves the right for reasons of public order to appoint for certain refugees or groups of refugees a principal place of residence."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND[8,18,21,31,32,33,34,36,37]

The Channel Islands and the Isle of Man

"(i) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland understand articles 8 and 9 as not preventing the taking in the Isle of Man and in the Channel Islands, in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances, of measures in the interests of national security in the case of a refugee on the ground of his nationality. The provisions of article 8 shall not prevent the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland from exercising any rights over property or interests which they may acquire or have acquired as an Allied or Associated Power under a Treaty of Peace or other agreement or arrangement for the restoration of peace which has been or may be completed as a result of the Second World War. Furthermore, the provisions of article 8 shall not affect the treatment to be accorded to any property or interests which at the date of the entry into force of this Convention for the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands are under the control of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland by reason of a state of war which exists or existed between them and any other state.

"(ii) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland accept paragraph 2 of article 17 in its application to the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands with the substitution of "four years" for "three years" in sub-paragraph (a) and with the omission of subparagraph (c).

"(iii) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland can only undertake that the provisions of sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 1 of article 24 and of paragraph 2 of that article will be applied in the Channel Islands so far as the law allows, and that the provisions of that sub-paragraph, in respect of such matters referred to therein as fall within the scope of the Isle of Man Health Service, and of paragraph 2 of that article will be applied in the Isle of Man so far as the law allows.

"(iv) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland cannot undertake that effect will be given in the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands to paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 25 and can only undertake that the provisions of paragraph 3 will be applied in the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands so far as the law allows.

"The considerations upon which certain of these reservations are based are similar to those set out in the memorandum relating to the corresponding reservations made in respect of the United Kingdom, which was enclosed in my note under reference."

British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Cyprus, Dominica, Falkland Islands, Fiji, Gambia, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Jamaica, Kenya, Mauritius, St. Vincent, Seychelles and Somaliland Protectorate

[Same reservations, in essence, as those made for the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man.]

Zanzibar and St. Helena

[Same reservations, in essence, as those made for the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man under Nos. (i), (iii) and (iv).]

British Honduras

[Same reservations, in essence, as those made for the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man under No. (i).]

Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland

[Same reservations, in essence, as those made for the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man.]

Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate and Swaziland

[Same reservations, in essence, as those made for the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man under Nos. (i), (iii) and (iv).]

The Bahama Islands

"Subject to the following reservation in respect of paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 17 of the Convention:

"Refugees and their dependants would normally be subject to the same laws and regulations relating generally to the employment of non-Bahamians within the Commonwealth of the Bahama Islands, so long as they have not acquired Bahamian status."

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Supplement No. 20 (A/1775),* p.48.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 28 July 1951 and 15 December 1959, respectively declaring that it considered itself bound by alternative (b) of Section B(1) of the Convention.. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] On 27 April 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General that the Convention would apply to Macau. Subsequently, on 18 November and 3 December 1999, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Macao from the Governments of China and Portugal (see also note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portugal" regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with the reservation made by China will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[4] Czechoslovakia had acceeded to the Convention on 26 November 1991 declaring that it considered itself bound by alternative (b) of Section B (1) of the Convention. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 4 September 1990 choosing alternative (b) of Section B (1) of the Convention. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] Upon notifying its succession (29 November1978) the Government of Suriname informed the Secretary-General that the Republic of Suriname did not succeed to the reservations formulated on 29 July 1951 by the Netherlands when the Convention and Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees were extended to Suriname.

[8] In a declaration contained in the notification of succession to the Convention, the Government of Tuvalu confirmed that it regards the Convention [. . .] as continuing in force subject to reservations previously made by the Government of the United

Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in relation to the Colony of the Gilbert and Ellice Islands.

[9] The instrument of accession was accompanied by the following communication:

"Having transmitted to the Secretary-General the Instrument of Accession of Ukraine simultaneously to the 1951 Convention and 1967 Protocol relating to the status of refugees, and in view of the fact that the Protocol provides in article I (2) that "the term 'refugee' shall...mean any person within the definition of article 1 of the Convention as if the words 'As result of events occurring before 1 anuary 1951 and...'and the words '...as a result of such events' in article 1 A (2) were omitted" and thus modifies in effect the provisions of article 1 of the Convention, it is the position of the Government of Ukraine that no separate declaration under article 1 B (1) of the Convention is required in the circumstances."

[10] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[11] States having previously specified alternative (a) under section B (1) of article 1.

[12] Notifications of the extension of their obligations under the Convention by adopting alternative (b) of section B (1) of article 1 of the Convention were received by the Secretary-General on the dates indicated:

Participant	***Date of notification***		
Argentina	5	Nov	1984
Australia	1	Dec	1967
Benin	6	Jul	1970
Brazil	14	Feb	1990
Cameroon	29	Dec	1961
Central African Republic	15	Oct	1962
Chile	28	Jan	1972
Colombia	10	Oct	1961
Côte d'Ivoire	20	Dec	1966
Ecuador	1	Feb	1972
France	3	Feb	1971
Holy See	17	Nov	1961
Hungary	8	Jan	1998
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	27	Sep	1976
Italy	1	Mar	1990
Latvia	3	Nov	1997
Luxembourg	22	Aug	1972
Malta	17	Jan	2002
Niger	7	Dec	1964
Paraguay	10	Jan	1991
Peru	8	Dec	1980
Portugal	13	Jul	1976
Senegal	12	Oct	1964
Sudan	7	Mar	1974
Togo	23	Oct	1962

[13] On 21 January 1983, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Botswana the following communication:

"Having simultaneously acceded to the Convention and Protocol [relating to the status of refugees done at New York on 31January 1967] on the 6th January 1969 and in view of the fact that the Protocol provides in article I (2) that the term 'refugee' shall ...mean any person within the definition of article 1 of the Convention' as if the words `As a result of events occurring before 1 January 1951 and' . . . and the words `. . . as a result of such events', in article [I(A)(2)] were omitted and thus modifies in effect the provisions of article 1 of the Convention, it is the position of the Government of Botswana that no separate declaration under article 1.B(1) of the Convention is required in the circumstances."

On the basis of the afore-mentioned communication, the Secretary-General has included Botswana in the list of States having chosen formula (b) under section B of article 1.

Subsequently, in a communication, received by the Secretary-General on 29 April 1986, and with reference to article 1 B (1) of the above-mentioned Convention, the Government of Botswana confirmed that it has no objection to be listed among the States applying the Convention without any geographical limitation.

[14] The instrument of accession contains the following declaration:

"... The mandatory declaration specifying which of the two meanings in Article 1 (B) (l) a Contracting State applies for the purpose of its obligations under the Convention has been superseded by the provisions of Article 1 of the Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees of 31 January 1967. Furthermore, the previous date-line would render Malawi's accession nugatory.

"Consequently, and since [the Government of the Republic of Malawi] is simultaneously acceding to the said Protocol, the obligations hereby assumed by the Government of the Republic of Malawi are not limited by the previous dateline or bounded by the concomi tant geographic limitation in the Convention."

On the basis of the above declaration, the Secretary-General has included Malawi in the list of States having chosen formula (b) under sec tion B of article l.

Further, on 4 February 1988, the Secretary-General received the following declaration from the Government of Malawi:

"When making the declaration under Section B of article 1 of the Convention, the Government of the Republic of Malawi intended and intends to apply the Convention and the Protocol thereto liberally in the lines of article 1 of the Protocol without being bounded by the geographic limitation or the dateline specified in the Convention.

"In the view of the Government of the Republic of Malawi the formula in the Convention is static and the Government of the Republic of Malawi's position, as stated, merely seeks to assist in the progressive development of international law in this area as epitomised by the 1967 Protocol. It is therefore the view of the Government of the Republic of Malawi that the declaration is consistent with the objects and purposes of the Convention and it entails the assumption of obligation beyond but perfectly consistent with those of the Convention and the Protocol thereto."

In view of the said declaration, Malawi remains listed among those States which, in accordance with Section B of article 1 of the Convention, will apply the said Convention to events occurring in Europe or elsewhere before 1 January 1951.

[15] In a communication received on 1 December 1967, the Government of Australia notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of the reservations to articles 17, 18, 19, 26 and 32, and, in a communication received by the Secretary-General on 11 March 1971, of the withdrawal of the reservation to paragraph 1 of article 28 of the Convention. For the text of those reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol.189, p.202.

[16] These reservations replace those made at the time of signature. For the text of reservations made on signature, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol.189, p.186.

[17] On 7 April 1972, upon its accession to the Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees done at New York on 31 January 1967, the Government of Brazil withdraws its reservations excluding articles 15 and 17, paragraphs 1 and 3, from its application to the Convention. For the text of the said reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 380, p.430.

[18] On notifying its succession to the Convention, the Government of Cyprus confirmed the reservations made at the time of the extension of the Convention to its territory by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. For the text of these reservations, see *"Declarations and reservations made upon notification of territorial application"* under United Kingdom.

[19] In a communication received on 23 August 1962, the Government of Denmark informed the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw as from 1 October 1961 the reservation to article 14 of the Convention.

In a communication received on 25 March 1968, the Government of Denmark informed the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw as from that date the reservations made on ratification to paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of article 24 and partially the reservation made on ratification to article 17 by rewording the said reservation. For the text of the reservations originally formulated by the Government of Denmark on ratification, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol.189, p.198.

[20] On 7 October 2004, the Government of Finland informed the Secretary-General of the following:

"WHEREAS the Instrument of Accession contained reservations, inter alia, to Article 7, paragraph 2; Article 8; Article 12, paragraph 1; Article 24, paragraph 1 (b) and paragraph 3; Article 25 and Article 28, paragraph 1 in the Convention;

NOW THEREFORE the Government of the Republic of Finland do hereby withdraw the said reservations, while the general reservation concerning nationals of Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden and the reservation on Article 24, paragraph 3, will remain."

The original reservations made upon accession, read as follows:

"[S]ubject to the following reservations: (1)
A general reservation to the effect that the application of those provisions of the Convention which grant to refugees the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country shall not be affected by the fact that special rights and privileges are now or may in future be accorded by Finland to the nationals of Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden or to the nationals of any one of those Countries;

(2) A reservation to article 7, paragraph 2, to the effect that Finland is not prepared, as a general measure, to grant refugees who fulfil the conditions of three years residence in Finland an exemption from any legislative reciprocity which Finnish law may have stipulated as a condition governing an alien's eligibility for same right or privilege;

(3) A reservation to article 8 to the effect that that article shall not be binding on Finland;

(4) A reservation to article 12, paragraph 1, to the effect that the Convention shall not modify the rule of Finnish private international law, as now in force, under which the personal status of a refugee is governed by the law of his country of nationality;

(5) A reservation to article 24, paragraph 1 (b) and paragraph 3 to the effect that they shall not be binding on Finland;

(6) A reservation to article 25,ffect that Finland does not consider itself bound to cause a certificate to be delivered by a Finnish authority, in the place of the authorities of a foreign country, if the documentary records necessary for the delivery of such certificate do not exist in Finland;

(7) A reservation with respect to the provisions contained in paragraph 1 of article 28. Finland does not accept the obligations stipulated in the said paragraph, but is prepared to recognize travel documents issued by other Contracting States pursuant to this article."

[21] On notifying its succession to the Convention, the Government of Gambia confirmed the reservations made at the time of the extension of the Convention to its territory by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

[22] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 19 April 1978, the Government of Greece declared that it withdrew the reservations that it had made upon ratification pertaining to articles 8, 11, 13, 24 (3), 26, 28, 31, 32 and 34, and also the objection contained in paragraph 6 of the relevant declaration of reservations by Greece is also withdrawn.

Subsequently, in a notification received on 27 February 1995, the Government of Greece notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation to article 17 made upon ratification. For the text of the reservations and objection so withdrawn, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 354, p.402.

[23] In a communication received on 26 April 2007, the Government of the Republic of Guatemala notified the Secretary-General that it has decided to withdraw the reservation and declaration made upon accession to the Convention. The text of the reservation and declaration withdrawn reads as follows:

The Republic of Guatemala accedes to the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its Protocol, with the reservation that it will not apply provisions of those instruments in respect of which the Convention allows reservations if those provisions contravene constitutional precepts in Guatemala or norms of public order under domestic law.

The expression "treatment as favourable as possible" in all articles of the Convention and of the Protocol in which the expression is used should be interpreted as not including rights which, under law or treaty, the Republic of Guatemala has accorded or is according to nationals of the Central American countries or of other countries with which it has concluded or is entering into agreements of a regional nature.

[24] In a communication received on 23 October 1968, the Government of Ireland notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of two of its reservations in respect of article 29 (1), namely those indicated at (a) and (b) of paragraph 5 of declarations and reservations contained in the instrument of accession by the Government of Ireland to the Convention; for the text of the withdrawn reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 254, p.412.

[25] In a communication received on 20 October 1964, the Government of Italy has notified the Secretary-General that "it withdraws the reservations made at the time of signature, and confirmed at the time of ratification, to articles 6, 7, 8, 19, 22, 23, 25 and 34 of the Convention [see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol.189, p. 192]. The above-mentioned reservations are inconsistent with the internal provisions issued by the Italian Government since the ratification of the Convention. The Italian Government also adopted in December 1963 provisions which implement the contents of paragraph 2 of article 17".

Furthermore, the Italian Government confirms that "it maintains its declaration made in accordance with section B (1) of article 1, and that it recognizes the provisions of articles 17 and 18 as recommendations only". *(See also note 12 .)*

Subsequently, in a communication received on 1 March 1990, the Government of Italy notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the declaration by which the provisions of articles 17 and 18 were recognized by it as recommendations only. For the complete text of the reservations see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 189, p.192.

[26] The instrument of accession deposited by the Government of Malta was accompanied by the following reservation:

"Article 7, paragraph 2, articles 14, 23, 27 and 28 shall not apply to Malta, and article 7, paragraphs 3, 4 and 5, articles 8, 9, 11, 17, 18, 31, 32 and 34 shall apply to Malta compatibly with its own special problems, its peculiar position and characteristics."

On 17 January 2002, the Secretary-General received the following communication from the Government of Malta:

"The Government of Malta.....hereby withdraws the reservations relating to article 7 (2), Articles 14, 27, 28, 7 (3)(4), (5), 8, 9, 17, 18, 31 and 32; ... and confirms that: "Article 23 shall not apply to Malta, and articles 11, and 34 shall apply to Malta compatibly and with its own special problems, its peculiar position and characteristics." Further, on 24 February 2004, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Malta, the following communication:

[The Government of Malta] "declare that the Government of Malta, having reviewed the remaining reservations and declaration, hereby withdraws the reservations relating to Article 23, and the reservations in respect of Articles 11 and 34 wherein these applied to Malta compatibly with its own special problems, its peculiar positions and characteristics."

[27] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 21 January 1954, the Government of Norway gave notice of the withdrawal, with immediate effect, of the reservation to article 24 of the Convention, "as the Acts mentioned in the said reservation have been amended to accord to refugees lawfully staying in the country the same treatment as is accorded to Norwegian nationals". For the text of that reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol.189, p.198.

[28] The text, which was communicated in a notification received on 13 July 1976, replaces the reservations originally made by Portugal upon accession. For the text of the reservations withdrawn, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 383, p.314.

[29] In a communication received on 20 April 1961, the Government of Sweden gave notice of the withdrawal, as from 1 July 1961, of the reservation to article 14 of the Convention.

In a communication received on 25 November 1966, the Government of Sweden has notified the Secretary-General that it has decided, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 42 of the Convention, to withdraw some of its reservations to article 24, paragraph 1 (b), by rewording them and to withdraw the reservation to article 24, paragraph 2.

In a communication received on 5 March 1970, the Government of Sweden notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of its reservation to article 7, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

For the text of the reservations as originally formulated by the Government of Sweden upon ratification, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 200, p. 336.

[30] In a communication received on 18 February 1963, the Government of Switzerland gave notice to the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of the reservation made at the time of ratification to article 24, paragraph 1 (a) and (b) and paragraph 3, of the Convention, in so far as that reservation concerns old-age and survivors' insurance.

In a communication received on 3 July 1972, the Government of Switzerland gave notice of its withdrawal of the reservation to article 17 formulated in its instrument of ratification of the Convention.

In a communication received on 17 December 1980, the Government of Switzerland gave notice of its withdrawal, in its entirety, of the subsisting reservation formulated in respect of article 24, number 1, letters a and b, which encompasses training, apprenticeship and unemployment insurance with effect from 1 January 1981, date of entry into force of the Swiss Law on Asylum of 5 October 1979. For the text of the reservations made initially, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 202, p. 368.

[31] See succession by Jamaica.

[32] See succession by Kenya.

[33] In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 22 March 1968, the President of the Republic of Malawi, referring to the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, done at Geneva on 28 July 1951, stated the following:

"In my letter to you of the 24th November 1964, concerning the disposition of Malawi's inherited treaty obligations, my Government declared that with respect to multilateral treaties which had been applied or extended to the former Nyasaland Protectorate, any Party to such a treaty could on the basis of reciprocity rely as against Malawi on the terms of such treaty until Malawi notified its depositary of what action it wished to take by way of confirmation of termination, confirmation of succession, or accession.

"I am now to inform you as depositary of this Convention that the Government of Malawi wishes to terminate any connection with this Convention which it might have inherited. The Government of Malawi considers that any legal relationship with the aforementioned Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, Geneva, 1951 which might have devolved upon it by way of succession from the ratification of the United Kingdom, is terminated as of this date."

See succession by Zambia.

[34] See succession by Botswana (formerly Bechuanaland Protectorate).

[35] On 3 October 1983, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following objection :

[The Government of Argentina makes a] formal objection to the declaration of territorial extension issued by the United Kingdom with regard to the Malvinas Islands (and dependencies), which that country is illegally occupying and refers to as the "Falkland Islands".

The Argentine Republic rejects and considers null and void the [declaration] of territorial extension.

With reference to the above-mentioned objection the Secretary-General received, on 28 February 1985, from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following declaration:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to their right, by notification to the Depositary under the relevant provisions of the above-mentioned Convention, to extend the application of the Convention in question to the Falkland Islands or to the Falkland Islands Dependencies, as the case may be.

For this reason alone, the Government of the United Kingdom are unable to regard the Argentine [communication] under reference as having any legal effect."

[36] See note 1 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[37] See succession by Fiji.

3. Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons

New York, 28 September 1954

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 6 June 1960, in accordance with article 39.
REGISTRATION: 6 June 1960, No. 5158.
STATUS: Signatories: 23. Parties: 63.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 360, p.117.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the United Nations Conference on the Status of Stateless Persons, held at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York from 13 to 23 September 1954. The Conference was convened pursuant to resolution 526A (XVII)[1] of 26 April 1954 of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. For the Final Act, recommendation and resolution adopted by the Conference, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 360, p. 117.

Participant	*Signature*	*Accession(a), Succession(d), Ratification*
Albania		23 Jun 2003 a
Algeria		15 Jul 1964 a
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 d
Argentina		1 Jun 1972 a
Armenia		18 May 1994 a
Australia		13 Dec 1973 a
Austria		8 Feb 2008 a
Azerbaijan		16 Aug 1996 a
Barbados		6 Mar 1972 d
Belgium	28 Sep 1954	27 May 1960
Belize		14 Sep 2006 a
Bolivia		6 Oct 1983 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]		1 Sep 1993 d
Botswana		25 Feb 1969 d
Brazil	28 Sep 1954	13 Aug 1996
Chad		12 Aug 1999 a
China[3]		
Colombia	30 Dec 1954	
Costa Rica	28 Sep 1954	2 Nov 1977
Croatia[2]		12 Oct 1992 d
Czech Republic		19 Jul 2004 a
Denmark	28 Sep 1954	17 Jan 1956
Ecuador	28 Sep 1954	2 Oct 1970
El Salvador	28 Sep 1954	
Fiji		12 Jun 1972 d
Finland		10 Oct 1968 a
France	12 Jan 1955	8 Mar 1960
Germany[4,5]	28 Sep 1954	26 Oct 1976
Greece		4 Nov 1975 a
Guatemala	28 Sep 1954	28 Nov 2000
Guinea		21 Mar 1962 a
Holy See	28 Sep 1954	
Honduras	28 Sep 1954	
Hungary		21 Nov 2001 a
Ireland		17 Dec 1962 a
Israel	1 Oct 1954	23 Dec 1958
Italy	20 Oct 1954	3 Dec 1962
Kiribati		29 Nov 1983 d
Latvia		5 Nov 1999 a
Lesotho		4 Nov 1974 d
Liberia		11 Sep 1964 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 May 1989 a
Liechtenstein	28 Sep 1954	
Lithuania		7 Feb 2000 a
Luxembourg	28 Oct 1955	27 Jun 1960
Madagascar[6]		[20 Feb 1962 a]
Mexico		7 Jun 2000 a
Montenegro[7]		23 Oct 2006 d
Netherlands	28 Sep 1954	12 Apr 1962
Norway	28 Sep 1954	19 Nov 1956
Philippines	22 Jun 1955	
Republic of Korea		22 Aug 1962 a
Romania		27 Jan 2006 a
Rwanda		4 Oct 2006 a
Senegal		21 Sep 2005 a
Serbia[2]		12 Mar 2001 d
Slovakia		3 Apr 2000 a
Slovenia[2]		6 Jul 1992 d
Spain		12 May 1997 a
St. Vincent and the Grenadines		27 Apr 1999 d
Swaziland		16 Nov 1999 a
Sweden	28 Sep 1954	2 Apr 1965
Switzerland	28 Sep 1954	3 Jul 1972

Participant	Signature	Accession(a), Succession(d), Ratification
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[2]		18 Jan 1994 d
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 d
Tunisia		29 Jul 1969 a
Uganda		15 Apr 1965 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[3]	28 Sep 1954	16 Apr 1959
Uruguay		2 Apr 2004 a
Zambia		1 Nov 1974 d
Zimbabwe		1 Dec 1998 d

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA

"The Government of Antigua and Barbuda can only undertake that the provisions of articles 23, 24, 25 and 31 will be applied in Antigua and Barbuda so far as the law allows."

ARGENTINA

The application of this Convention in territories whose sovereignty is the subject of discussion between two or more States, irrespective of whether they are parties to the Convention, cannot be construed as an alteration, renunciation or relinquishment of the position previously maintained by each of them.

AUSTRIA

Reservation:

The Republic of Austria shall only be bound by Article 27 insofar as it applies to stateless persons lawfully in the territory of the Republic of Austria.

Declaration:

The Republic of Austria will fulfil its obligation under Article 28 by issuing alien passports to stateless persons lawfully staying in its territory.

BARBADOS

"The Government of Barbados . . . declares with regard to the reservations made by the United Kingdom on notification of the territorial application of the Convention to the West Indies (including Barbados) on the 19th March, 1962 that it can only undertake that the provisions of Articles 23, 24, 25 and 31 will be applied in Barbados so far as the law allows.

"The application of the Convention to Barbados was also made subject to reservations to Articles 8, 9 and 26 which are hereby withdrawn."

BOTSWANA[8]

"(a) Article 31 of the said Convention shall not oblige Botswana to grant to a stateless person a status more favourable than that accorded to aliens in general;

"(b) Articles 12 1) and 7 2) of the Convention shall be recognized as recommendations only."

COSTA RICA[9]

CZECH REPUBLIC

Declarations:

" ...Acceding to the Convention we declare the following:

1. Pursuant to Article 27 of the Convention, identity papers shall be issued only to stateless persons having permanent residence permits in the territory of the Czech Republic in accordance with the country's national legislation.
2. Article 23 of the Convention shall be applied to the extent provided by the national legislation of the Czech Republic.
3. Article 24, paragraph 1(b) shall be applied to the extent provided by the national legislation of the Czech Republic.
4. Pursuant to Article 28 of the Convention, travel documents shall be issued to stateless persons having permanent residence permits in the territory of the Czech Republic in accordance with the country's national legislation. Such persons shall be issued "aliens' passports" stating that their holders are stateless persons under the Convention of 28th September 1954."

DENMARK[10]

Denmark is not bound by article 24, paragraph 3.

The provisions of article 24, paragraph 1, under which stateless persons are in certain cases placed on the same footing as nationals, shall not oblige Denmark to grant stateless persons in every case exactly the same remuneration as that provided by law for nationals, but only to grant them what is required for their support.

Article 31 shall not oblige Denmark to grant to stateless persons a status more favourable than that accorded to aliens in general.

EL SALVADOR

Upon signature :

El Salvador signs the present Convention with the reservation that the expression "treatment as favourable as possible", referred to in those of its provisions to which reservations may be made, must not be understood to include the special treatment which has been or may be granted to the nationals of Spain, the Latin American countries in general, and in particular to the countries which constituted the United Provinces of Central America and now form the Organization of Central American States.

FIJI

The Government of Fiji stated that the first and third reservations made by the United Kingdom are affirmed but have been redrafted as more suitable to the application of Fiji in the following terms:

"1. The Government of Fiji understands articles 8 and 9 as not preventing them from taking in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances measures in the interests of national security in the case of a stateless person on the ground of his former nationality. The provisions of article 8 shall not prevent the Government of Fiji from exercising any rights over property or interests which they may acquire or have acquired as an Allied or Associated Power under a Treaty of Peace or other agreement or arrangement for the restoration of peace which has been or may be completed as a result of the Second World War. Furthermore the provisions of article 8 shall not affect the treatment to be accorded to any property or interests which at the date of entry into force of this Convention in respect of Fiji were under the control of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland or of the Government of Fiji respectively by reason of a state of war which existed between them and any other State.

"2. The Government of Fiji cannot undertake to give effect to the obligations contained in paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 25 and can only undertake to apply the provisions of paragraph 3 so far as the law allows.

"Commentary: No arrangements exist in Fiji for the administrative assistance for which provision is made in article 25 nor have any such arrangements been found necessary in the case of stateless persons. Any need for the documents or certificates mentioned in paragraph 2 of that article would be met by affidavit.

"All other reservation made by the United Kingdom to the above-mentioned Convention is withdrawn."

FINLAND[11]

"(1) A general reservation to the effect that the application of those provisions of the Convention which grant to stateless persons the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country shall not be affected by the fact that special rights and privileges are now or may in future be accorded by Finland to the nationals of Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden or to the nationals of any one of those Countries;

"(2) A reservation to article 7, paragraph 2, to the effect that Finland is not prepared, as a general measure, to grant stateless persons who fulfil the conditions of three years residence in Finland an exemption from any legislative reciprocity which Finnish law may have stipulated as a condition governing an alien's eligibility for same right or privilege;

"(3) A reservation to article 8 to the effect that that article shall not be binding on Finland;

"(4) . . .

"(5) A reservation to article 24, paragraph 1 (b) and paragraph 3 to the effect that they shall not be binding on Finland;

"(6) A reservation to article 25, to the effect that Finland does not consider itself bound to cause a certificate to be delivered by a Finnish authority, in the place of the authorities of a foreign country, if the documentary records necessary for the delivery of such certificate do not exist in Finland;

"(7) A reservation with respect to the provisions contained in article 28. Finland does not accept the obligations stipulated in the said article, but is prepared to recognize travel documents issued by other Contracting States pursuant to this article."

FRANCE

The provisions of article 10, paragraph 2, are regarded by the French Government as applying only to stateless persons who were forcibly displaced from French territory, and who have, prior to the date of entry into force of this Convention, returned there direct from the country to which they were forced to proceed, without in the meantime having received authorization to reside in the territory of any other State.

GERMANY[4,5]

1. Article 23 will be applied without restriction only to stateless persons who are also refugees within the meaning of the Convention of 28 July 1951 relating to the Status of Refugees and the Protocol of 31 January 1967 relating to the Status of Refugees, but otherwise only to the extent provided for under national legislation;
2. Article 27 will not be applied.

GUATEMALA

Upon signature:

Reservation:

Guatemala signs the present Convention with the reservation that the expression "treatment as favourable as possible", referred to in those of its provisions to which reservations may be made, must not be understood to include the special treatment which has been or may be granted to the nationals of, Spain, the Latin American countries in general, and in particular to the countries which constituted the United Provinces of Central America and now form the Organization of Central American States.

Upon ratification:

Confirmation of the reservation made upon signature, as modified:

Reservation:

Guatemala ratifies the present Convention with the reservation that the expression "treatment as favourable as possible", referred to in those of its provisions to which reservations may be made, shall not be understood to include the special treatment which Guatemala has granted or may grant to nationals of Spain, the Latin American countries in general, and in particular the countries which constitute the Central American Integration System (SICA), which are those countries which constituted the United Provinces of Central America, plus the Republic of Panama.

HOLY SEE

"The Convention will be applied in the form compatible with the special nature of the State of the Vatican City and without prejudice to the norms that grant access thereunto and sojourn therein."

HONDURAS

Upon signature:

Honduras signs the present Convention with the reservation that the expression "treatment as favourable as possible", referred to in those of its provisions to which reservations may be made, must not be understood to include the special treatment which has been or may be granted to the nationals of Spain, the Latin American countries in general, and in particular to the countries which constituted the United Provinces of Central America and now form the Organization of Central American States.

HUNGARY

Reservations:

Reservation to Articles 23 and 24 of the Convention:

"The Republic of Hungary shall apply the provisions contained in Articles 23 and 24 in such a way that it ensures to stateless persons having permanent domestic residence equal treatment with its own citizens."

Reservation to Article 28 of the Convention:

" The Republic of Hungary shall apply the provisions contained in Article 28 by issuing a travel document in both Hungarian and English languages, entitled 'Utazási Igazolvány hontalan személy részére / Travel Document for Stateless Person' and supplied with the indication set out in Paragraph 1, Subparagraph 1 of the Schedule to the Convention."

IRELAND

Declaration:

"The Government of Ireland understand the words `public order' and `in accordance with due process of law', as they appear in article 31 of the Convention, to mean respectively, `public policy' and `in accordance with the procedure provided by law'."

Reservation:

"With regard to article 29 (1), the Government of Ireland do not undertake to accord to stateless persons treatment more favourable than that accorded to aliens generally with respect to

(a) The stamp duty chargeable in Ireland in connection with conveyances, transfers and leases of lands, tenements and hereditaments, and

(b) Income tax (including sur-tax)."

ITALY[12]

The provisions of articles 17 and 18 are recognized as recommendations only.

KIRIBATI

Reservations:

[The following reservations originally made by the United Kingdom were reformulated as follows in terms suited to their direct application to Kiribati] :

"1. The Government of Kiribati understands articles 8 and 9 as not preventing them from taking in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances measures in the interests of national security in the case of a stateless person on the ground of his former nationality. The provisions of article 8 shall not prevent the Government of Kiribati from exercising any rights over property or interests which they may acquire or have acquired as an Allied or Associated Power under a Treaty of Peace or other agreement or arrangement for the restoration of peace which has been or may be completed as a result of the Second World War. Furthermore, the provisions of article 8 shall not affect the treatment to be accorded to any property or interest which at the date of entry into force of this Convention in respect of the Gilbert Islands were under the control of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland by reason of a state of war which exists or existed between them and any other State.

"2. The Government of Kiribati can only undertake to apply the provisions of sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 1 of article 24 so far as the law allows.

"3. The Government of Kiribati cannot undertake to give effect to the obligations contained in paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 25 and can only undertake to apply the provisions of paragraph 3 so far as the law allows."

LATVIA

Reservations:

"In accordance with article 38 of the [Convention] the Republic of Latvia reserves the right to apply the provisions of paragraph 1 (b) of Article 24 subject to limitations provided for by the national legislation."

"In accordance with article 38 of the [Convention] the Republic of Latvia reserves the right to apply the provisions of Article 27 subject to limitations provided for by the national legislation."

LESOTHO[13]

"1. In accordance with article 38 of the Convention, the Government of the Kingdom of Lesotho declares that it understands articles 8 and 9 as not preventing it from taking in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances measures in the interest of national security in the case of a stateless person on the ground of his former nationality. The provisions of article 8 shall not prevent the Government of the Kingdom of Lesotho from exercising any rights over property or interests which they may acquire or have acquired as an Allied or Associated Power under a Treaty of Peace or other agreement or arrangement for the restoration of peace which has been or may be completed as a result of the Second World War. Furthermore the provisions of article 8 shall not affect the treatment to be accorded to any property or interests which at the date of entry into force of this Convention in respect of Lesotho were under the control of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland or of the Government of Lesotho by reason of a state of war which existed between them and any other State.

"2. The Government of the Kingdom of Lesotho cannot undertake to give effect to the obligations contained in paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 25 and can only undertake to apply the provisions of paragraph 3 so far as the laws of Lesotho allow.

"3. The Government of the Kingdom of Lesotho shall not be bound under article 31 to grant to a stateless person a status more favourable than that accorded to aliens generally."

MEXICO

Reservations:

The Government of Mexico is convinced of the importance of ensuring that all stateless persons can obtain wage-earning employment as a means of subsistence and affirms that stateless persons will be treated, in accordance with the law, under the same conditions as aliens in general, without prejudice to the application of article 7 of the Federal Labour Act, which establishes the proportion of alien workers that employers are authorized to employ in Mexico, as well as other legal principles relating to work by aliens in the country, for which reason the Government of Mexico lodges an express reservation to article 17 of this Convention.

The Government of Mexico lodges an express reservation to article 31 of the Convention, and, therefore, refers to the application of article 33 of the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States.

The Government of Mexico does not consider itself obliged to guarantee stateless persons greater facilities for their naturalization than those accorded to aliens in general, for which reason it lodges an express reservation to the contents of article 32 of the Convention.

NETHERLANDS

The Government of the Kingdom reserves the right not to apply the provisions of article 8 of the Convention to stateless persons who previously possessed enemy nationality or the equivalent thereof with respect to the Kingdom of Netherlands;

With reference to article 26 of the Convention, the Government of the Kingdom reserves the right to designate a place of principal residence for certain stateless persons or groups of stateless persons in the public interest.

PHILIPPINES

Upon signature:

"(a) As regards Article 17, paragraph 1, granting stateless persons the right to engage in wage-earning employment, [the Government of the Philippines] finds that this provision conflicts with the Philippine Immigration Act of 1940, as amended, which classifies as excludable aliens under Section 29 those coming to the Philippines to perform unskilled labour, and permits the admission of pre-arranged employees under Section 9 (g) only when there are no persons in the Philippines willing and competent to perform the labour or service for which the admission of aliens is desired.

"(b) As regards Article 31, paragraph 1, to the effect that `the Contracting States shall not expel a stateless person lawfully in their territory, save on grounds of national security or public order', this provision would unduly restrict the power of the Philippine Government to deport undesirable aliens under Section 37 of the same Immigration Act which states the various grounds upon which aliens may be deported.

"Upon signing the Convention [the Philippine Government], therefore hereby [registers] its non-conformity to the provisions of Article 17, paragraph 1, and Article 31, paragraph 1, thereof, for the reasons stated in (a) and (b) above."

ROMANIA

Reservation:

"1. With reference to the application of Article 23 of the Convention, Romania reserves its right to accord public relief only to stateless persons which are also refugees, under the provisions of the Convention of 28 July 1951 relating to the Status of Refugees and of the Protocol of 31 January 1967 relating to the Status of Refugees or, as the case may be, subject to the provisions of the domestic law;

2. With reference to the application of Article 27 of the Convention, Romania reserves its right to issue identity papers only to stateless persons to whom the competent authorities accorded the right to stay on the territory of Romania permanently or, as the case may be, for a determinated period, subject to the provisions of the domestic law;

3. With reference to the application of Article 31 of the Convention, Romania reserves its right to expel a stateless person staying lawfully on its territory whenever the stateless person committed an offence, subject to the provisions of the legislation in force."

SLOVAKIA

Declaration:

"The Slovak Republic shall not be bound by article 27 to that effect it shall issue identity papers to any stateless person that is not in possession of a valid travel document. The Slovak Republic shall issue identity papers only to the stateless person present on the territory of the Slovak Republic who have been granted long-term or permanent residence permit."

SPAIN

Reservation:

"[The Government of the Kingdom of Spain] makes a reservation to article 29, paragraph 1, and considers itself bound by the provisions of that paragraph only in the case of stateless persons residing in the territory of any of the Contracting States."

ST. VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES

Reservation:

"The Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines can only undertake that the provisions of articles 23, 24, 25 and 31 will be applied in St. Vincent and the Grenadines so far as the law allows."

SWEDEN[14]

Reservations:

(1) . . .

(2) To article 8. This article will not be binding on Sweden.

(3) To article 12, paragraph 1. This paragraph will not be binding on Sweden.

(4) To article 24, paragraph 1 (b). Notwithstanding the rule concerning the treatment of stateless persons as nationals, Sweden will not be bound to accord to stateless persons the same treatment as is accorded to nationals in respect of the possibility of entitlement to a national pension under the provisions of the National Insurance Act; and likewise to the effect that, in so far as the right to a supplementary pension under the said Act and the computation of such pension in certain respects are concerned, the rules applicable to Swedish nationals shall be more favour able than those applied to other insured persons.

(5) To article 24, paragraph 3. The provisions of this paragraph will not be binding on Sweden.

(6) To article 25, paragraph 2. Sweden does not consider itself obliged to cause a Swedish authority, in lieu of a foreign authority, to deliver certificates for the issuance of which there is insufficient documentation in Sweden.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Declaration:

"I have the honour further to state that the Government of the United Kingdom deposit the present instrument of ratification on the understanding that the combined effects of articles 36 and 38 permit them to include in any declaration or notification made under paragraph 1 of article 36 or paragraph 2 of article 36 respectively any reservation consistent with article 38 which the Government of the territory concerned might desire to make."

Reservations:

"When ratifying the Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons which was opened for signature at New York on September 28, 1954, the Government of the United Kingdom have deemed it necessary to make certain reservations in accordance with paragraph 1 of Article 38 thereof the text of which is reproduced below:

(1) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland understand Articles 8 and 9 as not preventing them from taking in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances measures in the interests of national security in the case of a stateless person on the ground of his former nationality. The provisions of Article 8 shall not prevent the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland from exercising any rights over property or interests which they may acquire or have acquired as an Allied or Associated Power under a Treaty of Peace or other agreement or arrangement for the restoration of peace which has been or may be completed as a result of the Second World War. Furthermore, the provisions of Article 8 shall not affect the treatment to be accorded to any property or interests which at the date of entry into force of this Convention for the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland are under the control of the

Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland by reason of a state of war which exists or existed between them and any other State.

(2) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, in respect of such of the matters referred to in sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 1 of Article 24 as fall within the scope of the National Health Service, can only undertake to apply the provisions of that paragraph so far as the law allows.

(3) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland cannot undertake to give effect to the obligations contained in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 25 and can only undertake to apply the provisions of paragraph 3 so far as the law allows."

Commentary : "In connexion with sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 1 of Article 24 which relates to certain matters within the scope of the National Health Service, the National Health Service (Amendment) Act 1949 contains powers for charges to be made to persons not ordinarily resident in Great Britain (which category would include some stateless persons) who receive treatment under the Service. These powers have not yet been exercised but it may be necessary to exercise them at some future date. In Northern Ireland the Health Services are restricted to persons ordinarily resident in the country except where regulations are made to extend the Services to others. For these reasons, the Government of the United Kingdom, while prepared in the future, as in the past, to give the most sympathetic consideration to the situation of stateless persons, find it necessary to make reservation to sub-paragraph (b) of Article 24.

"No arrangements exist in the United Kingdom for the administrative assistance for which provision is made in Article 25 nor have any such arrangements been found necessary in the case of stateless persons. Any need for the documents or certifications mentioned in paragraph 2 of that Article would be met by affidavit."

ZAMBIA[15]

"Article 22 (1):

The Government of the Republic of Zambia considers paragraph 1 of article 22 to be a recommendation only, and not a binding obligation to accord to stateless persons national treatment with respect to elementary education;

"Article 26:

The Government of the Republic of Zambia reserves the right under article 26 to designate a place or places of residence for stateless persons;

"Article 28:

The Government of the Republic of Zambia does not consider itself bound under article 28 to issue a travel document with a return clause in cases where a country of second asylum has accepted or indicated its willingness to accept a stateless person from Zambia;

"Article 31:

"The Government of the Republic of Zambia shall not undertake under article 31 to grant treatment more favourable than that accorded to aliens generally with respect to expulsion."

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
France	8 Mar 1960	Departments of Algeria, of the Oases and of Saoura, Guadeloupe, Martinique and Guiana and the five Overseas Territories (New Caledonia and Dependencies, French Polynesia, French Somaliland, the Comoro Archipelago and the Islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon)
Netherlands[16]	12 Apr 1962	Netherlands New Guinea and Suriname
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[3,13,17,18,19,20,21]	14 Apr 1959	Channel Islands and Isle of Man
	7 Dec 1959	High Commission Territories of Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate and Swaziland
	9 Dec 1959	Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland
	19 Mar 1962	Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, British Virgin Islands, Colony of Aden, Falkland Islands (Malvinas), Fiji, Gambia, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Hong Kong, Kenya, Malta, Mauritius, North Borneo, North Borneo, St. Helena, Sarawak, Seychelles, State of Singapore, Uganda, West Indies and Zanzibar

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated the declarations and reservations were made upon notification of territorial application.)

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND[3,13,17,18,19,20,21]

Channel Islands and Isle of Man

"(i) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland understand Articles 8 and 9 as not preventing the taking in the Isle of Man and in the Channel Islands, in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances, of measures in the interests of national security in the case of a stateless person on the ground of his former nationality. The provisions of Article 8 shall not prevent the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland from exercising any rights over property or interests which they may acquire or have acquired as an Allied or Associated Power under a Treaty of Peace or other agreement or arrangement for the restoration of peace which has been or may be completed as a result of the Second World War. Furthermore, the provisions of Article 8 shall not affect the treatment to be accorded to any property or interests which, at the date of entry into force of this Convention for the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands, are under the control of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland by reason of a state of war which exists or existed between them and any other State.

"(ii) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland can only undertake that the provisions of sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 1 of Article 24 and of paragraph 2 of that Article will be applied in the Channel Islands so far as the law allows, and that the provisions of that sub-paragraph, in respect of such matters referred to therein as fall within the scope of the Isle of Man Health Service, will be applied in the Isle of Man so far as the law allows.

"(iii) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland cannot undertake that effect will be given in the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands to paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 25 and can only undertake that the provisions of paragraph 3 will be applied in the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands so far as the law allows."

High Commission Territories of Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate and Souaziland

[Same reservations, in essence, as those made for the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man, under Nos. (i) and (iii).]

Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland

[Same reservations, in essence, as those made for the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man, under No. (iii).]

British Guiana, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Falkland Islands, Gambia, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Kenya, Mauritius

[Same reservations, in essence, as those made for the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man, under Nos. (i) and (iii)].

British Honduras, Hong Kong

[Same reservations, in essence, as those made for the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man, under Nos. (i) and (iii).]

North Borneo

[Same reservations, in essence, as those made for the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man.]

Fiji

(i) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland understand articles 8 and 9 as not preventing the taking in Fiji, in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances, of measures in the interests of national security in the case of a stateless person on the ground of his former nationality.

(ii) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, in respect of the provisions of sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 1 of article 24, can only undertake that effect will be given in Fiji to the provisions of that paragraph so far as the law allows.

(iii) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland cannot undertake that effect will be given in Fiji to paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 25 and can only undertake that the provisions of paragraph 3 will be applied in Fiji so far as the law allows.

The State of Singapore

(i) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland cannot undertake that effect will be given in the State of Singapore to article 23.

The West Indies

(i) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland cannot undertake that effect will be given in the West Indies to articles 8, 9, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 31.

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Seventeenth Session, Supplement, No. 1* (E/2596), p. 12.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had acceded to the Convention on 9 April 1959. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] On 10 June 1997, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from the Governments of the the United Kingdom and China (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

In addition, the notification made by the Government of China contained the following declaration:

The Government of the People's Republic of China cannot undertake that effect will be given in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region to article 25, paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Convention, and can only undertake that the provisions of paragraph 3 of the said article will be applied in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region so far as the law there allows.

Within the above ambit, responsibility for the international rights and obligations of a Party to the [said Convention] will be assumed by the Government of the People's Republic of China.

[4] Instrument of ratification received by the Secretary-General on 2 August 1976 and supplemented by notification of reservation received on 26 October 1976, the date on which the instrument is deemed to have been deposited. See also note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] By a notification received by the Secretary-General on 2 April 1965, the Government of Madagascar denounced the Convention; the denunciation took effect on 2 April 1966.

[7] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] In the notification of succession, the Government of Botswana also maintained the reservations made by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on extension of the Convention to the Bechuanaland Protectorate. For the text of the reservations, see *"Declarations and reservations made upon notification of territorial application"* , under United Kingdom.

[9] The reservation made upon signature was not maintained upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 360, p. 196.

[10] In a communication received on 23 August 1962, the Government of Denmark informed the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw as from 1 October 1961 the reservation to article 14 of the Convention.

In a communication received on 25 March 1968, the Government of Denmark informed the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw as from that date, the reservation to article 24, paragraph 2, of the Con vention. For the text of the reservations withdrawn by the above communications, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* ,vol. 360, p. 132.

[11] In a communication received on 30 September 1970, the Government of Finland notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation formulated in its instrument of accession to article 12, paragraph 1, of the Convention. For the text of the said reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 648, p. 368.

[12] In a communication received on 25 January 1968, the Government of Italy notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of the reservations made at the time of signature to articles 6, 7 (2), 8, 19, 22 (2), 23, 25 and 32 (see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 189, p. 192).

[13] Reservations 1 and 2 had been formulated by the Government of the United Kingdom in respect of the territory of Basutoland. Reservation 3 constitutes a new reservation, which was made subject to the provisions of article 39 (2) of the Convention.

[14] In a communication received on 25 November1966, the Government of Sweden has notified the Secretary-General that it has decided, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 38 of the Convention, to withdraw some of its reservations to article 24, paragraph 1 (b), and the reservation to article 24, paragraph 2 of the Convention. In a communication received on 5 March 1970, the Government of Sweden notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of its reservation to article 7, paragraph 2, of the Convention. For the text of the reservations to article 24, paragraph 1 (b), as originally formulated by the Government of Sweden in its instrument of ratification, and of the reservation to article 7, paragraph 2, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 529, p. 362.

[15] In its notification of succession, the Government of Zambia declared that it withdrew the reservations made by the Government of the United Kingdom upon extension of the Convention by the latter to the former Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. The reservations reproduced herein are new reservations, which were made subject to the provisions of article 39 (2) of the Convention.

[16] In the note accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Netherlands stated, with reference to article 36, paragraph 3 of the Convention, that "if at any time the Government of the Netherlands Antilles agrees to the extension of the Convention to its territory, the Secretary-General shall be notified thereof without delay. Such notification will contain the reservations, if any, which the Government of the Netherlands Antilles might wish to make with respect to local requirements in accordance with article 38 of the Convention." See also note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[17] See note 1 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[18] See accession by Uganda.

[19] See succession by Lesotho.

[20] See succession by Fiji.

[21] In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 22 March 1968, the President of the Republic of Malawi, referring to the Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, done at New York on 28 September 1954, stated the following:

"In my letter to you of the 24th November 1964, concerning the disposition of Malawi's inherited treaty obligations, my Government declared that with respect to multilateral treaties which had been applied or extended to the former Nyasaland Protectorate, any Party to such a treaty could on the basis of reciprocity rely as against Malawi on the terms of that treaty until Malawi notified its depositary of what action it wished to take by way of confirmation of termination, confirmation of succession, or accession.

"I am to inform you as depositary of this Convention that the Government of Malawi now wishes to terminate any connection with this Convention which it might have inherited. The Government of Malawi considers that any legal relationship with the afore-mentioned Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, New York, 1954 which might have devolved upon it by way of succession from the ratification of the United Kingdom, is terminated as of this date."

4. CONVENTION ON THE REDUCTION OF STATELESSNESS

New York, 30 August 1961

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	13 December 1975, in accordance with article 18.
REGISTRATION:	13 December 1975, No. 14458.
STATUS:	Signatories: 5. Parties: 35.
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 989, p. 175.

Note: The Convention was adopted and opened for signature by the United Nations Conference on the Elimination or Reduction of Future Statelessness, convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations pursuant to General Assembly resolution 896 (IX)[1] of 4 December 1954. The Conference met at the European Office of the United Nations at Geneva from 24 March to 18 April 1959 and reconvened at the Headquarters of the United Nations at New York from 15 to 28 August 1961.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Albania		9 Jul 2003 a
Armenia		18 May 1994 a
Australia		13 Dec 1973 a
Austria		22 Sep 1972 a
Azerbaijan		16 Aug 1996 a
Bolivia		6 Oct 1983 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina		13 Dec 1996 a
Brazil		25 Oct 2007 a
Canada		17 Jul 1978 a
Chad		12 Aug 1999 a
Costa Rica		2 Nov 1977 a
Czech Republic		19 Dec 2001 a
Denmark		11 Jul 1977 a
Dominican Republic	5 Dec 1961	
Finland		7 Aug 2008 a
France	31 May 1962	
Germany[2,3]		31 Aug 1977 a
Guatemala		19 Jul 2001 a
Ireland		18 Jan 1973 a
Israel	30 Aug 1961	
Kiribati		29 Nov 1983 d
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 a
Lesotho		24 Sep 2004 a
Liberia		22 Sep 2004 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 May 1989 a
Netherlands[4]	30 Aug 1961	13 May 1985
New Zealand[5]		20 Sep 2006 a
Niger		17 Jun 1985 a
Norway		11 Aug 1971 a
Romania		27 Jan 2006 a
Rwanda		4 Oct 2006 a
Senegal		21 Sep 2005 a
Slovakia		3 Apr 2000 a
Swaziland		16 Nov 1999 a
Sweden		19 Feb 1969 a
Tunisia		12 May 2000 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[6]	30 Aug 1961	29 Mar 1966
Uruguay		21 Sep 2001 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRIA

Declarations concerning article 8, paragraph 3 (a), (i) and (ii):

"Austria declares to retain the right to deprive a person of his nationality, if such person enters, on his own free will, the military service of a foreign State.

"Austria declares to retain the right to deprive a person of his nationality, if such person being in the service of a foreign State, conducts himself in a manner seriously prejudicial to the interests or to the prestige of the Republic of Austria."

FRANCE

At the time of signature of this Convention, the Government of the French Republic declares that it reserves the right to exercise the power available to it under article 8 (3) on the terms laid down in that paragraph, when it deposits the instrument of ratification of the Convention.

The Government of the French Republic also declares, in accordance with article 17 of the Convention, that it makes a reservation in respect of article 11, and that article 11 will not apply so far as the French Republic is concerned.

The Government of the French Republic further declares, with respect to article 14 of the Convention, that in accordance with article 17 it accepts the jurisdiction of the Court only in relation to States Parties to this Convention which shall also have accepted its jurisdiction subject to the same reservations; it also declares that article 14 will not apply when there exists between the French Republic and another party to this Convention an earlier treaty providing another method for the settlement of disputes between the two States.

GERMANY[3]

The Federal Republic of Germany will apply the said Convention:

(a) in respect of elimination of statelessness, to persons who are stateless under the terms of article 1, paragraph 1, of the Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons of 28 September 1954;

(b) in respect of prevention of statelessness and retention of nationality, to German nationals within the meaning of the Basic Law (Constitution) for the Federal Republic of Germany.

IRELAND

"In accordance with paragraph 3 of article 8 of the Convention Ireland retains the right to deprive a naturalised Irish citizen of his citizenship pursuant to section 19 (1) (b) of the Irish Nationality and Citizenship Act, 1956, on grounds specified in the aforesaid paragraph."

NEW ZEALAND

Declaration:

"[New Zealand] declares that in accordance with paragraph 3 of article 8 of the Convention New Zealand retains the right to deprive a person of his New Zealand citizenship on the following grounds, being grounds existing in New Zealand law at the present time:

the person has, while a New Zealand citizen and while of or over the age of 18 years and of full capacity,

(a) Acquired the nationality or citizenship of another country by any voluntary and formal act, and acted in a manner that is contrary to the interests of New Zealand; or

(b) Voluntarily exercised any of the privileges or performed any of the duties of another nationality or citizenship possessed by him in a manner that is contrary to the interests of New Zealand."

NIGER

With reservations in respect of articles 11, 14 and 15.

TUNISIA[7]

Reservation:

[The Government of Tunisia] declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 11 concerning the establishment of a body responsible for assisting in the presentation of claims to obtain nationality to the appropriate authorities, or of article 14, which provides for the competence of the International Court of Justice to rule on disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.

Declaration:

The Republic of Tunisia declares that, in accordance with article 8, paragraph 3, of the [Convention] , it retains the right to deprive a person of Tunisian nationality in the following circumstances as provided for in its existing national law:

1. If he occupies a post in the public service of a foreign State or in foreign armed forces and retains it for more than one month after being enjoined by the Government of Tunisia to leave the post, unless it is found that it was impossible for him to do so.
2. If he is convicted of an act held to be a crime or an offence against the external or internal security of the State.
3. If he engages, for the benefit of a foreign State, in acts which are incompatible with his status as a Tunisian national and which are prejudicial to Tunisia's interests.
4. If he is convicted in Tunisia or abroad for an act held to be a crime under Tunisian law and carrying a sentence of at least five years' imprisonment.
5. If he is convicted of evading his obligations under the law regarding recruitment into the armed forces.
6. If it is discovered, subsequent to issuance of the naturalization certificate, that the person concerned did not fulfil the conditions required by law allowing him to be naturalized.
7. If the alien has made a false declaration, employed fraudulent means or knowingly submitted a document containing a false or incorrect statement for the purpose of obtaining naturalization.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"[The Government of the United Kingdom declares that], in accordance with paragraph 3 (a) of Article 8 of the Convention, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 1 of Article 8, the United Kingdom retains the right to deprive a naturalised person of his nationality on the following grounds, being grounds existing in United Kingdom law at the present time: that, inconsistently with his duty of loyalty to Her Britannic Majesty, the person

"(i) Has, in disregard of an express prohibition of Her Britannic Majesty, rendered or continued to render services to, or received or continued to receive emoluments from, another State, or

"(ii) Has conducted himself in a manner seriously prejudicial to the vital interests of Her Britannic Majesty."

Objections

(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

FINLAND

&lt;Right&gt;7 August 2008&lt;/Right&gt;

"The Government of Finland has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Republic of Tunisia to the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness. The Government of Finland holds the view that such a declaration seeks to limit the duty of the Republic of Tunisia not to deprive a person of its nationality if such deprivation would render him or her stateless to an extent not covered by the exceptions of Article 8 paragraph 3 of the Convention. The declaration therefore amounts to a reservation which restricts one of the essential duties of the Convention in a way contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the declaration made by the Government of the Republic of Tunisia in respect of Article 8 of the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Tunisia and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without the Republic of Tunisia benefiting from the said declaration."

GERMANY

15 May 2001

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has examined the declaration to the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness made by the Government of the Republic of Tunisia upon its accession to the Convention. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany holds the view that such a declaration seeks to limit the duty of a state not to deprive a person of its nationality if such deprivation would render him stateless in an extent which is not covered by the exceptions of Article 8 paragraph 3 of the Convention. The declaration therefore restricts one of the essential duties of the Convention in a way contrary to the essence of the Convention. It is hence incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the declaration made by the Government of the Republic of Tunisia in respect of Article 8 of the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of Tunisia."

NORWAY

23 May 2001

"The Government of Norway has examined the contents of the reservation and declaration made by the Republic of Tunisia upon accession to the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.

The Convention prohibits the deprivation of nationality if it will render the person in question stateless. This prohibition is subject to certain limitations. It is the position of the Government of Norway that paragraph 3 and 4 of the Tunisian declaration are not justified under the Convention. The said paragraphs of the declaration are contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, as they aim at limiting the obligations that States undertake when acceding to it, the core obligation being to reduce statelessness.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Convention between the Kingdom of Norway and the Republic of Tunisia. The Convention thus becomes operative between Norway and Tunisia without Tunisia benefiting from the said declaration."

SWEDEN

23 May 2001

"The Government of Sweden has examined the declaration to the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness made by the Government of the Republic of Tunisia upon its accession to the Convention. The Government of Sweden is of the view that this declaration seeks to limit the duty of Tunisia not to deprive a person of its nationality if such deprivation would render him stateless in an extent which is not covered by the exceptions of Article 8 paragraph 3 of the Convention. The declaration therefore restricts one of the essential duties of the Convention and raises serious doubts as to the commitment of the republic of Tunisia to the object and purpose of the Convention.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. Furthermore, according to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969, and well-established customary international law, a reservation contrary to the object and purpose of the treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the declaration made by the Government of the Republic of Tunisia in respect of Article 8 of the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Tunisia and Sweden."

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
France	31 May 1962	The Convention will apply to the Overseas Departments and the Overseas Territories of the French Republic
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[6]	29 Mar 1966	(a) The Convention shall apply to the following non-metropolitan territories for the international relations of which the United Kingdom is responsible:Antigua, Bahamas, Barbados, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Cayman Islands, Channel Islands, Dominica, Falkland Islands, Fiji, Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Hong Kong, Isle of Man, Mauritius, Montserrat, St. Helena, St. Kitts, St. Lucia, St . Vincent, Seychelles, Swaziland, Turks and

Participant	***Date of receipt of the notification***	***Territories***
		Caicos Islands, Virgin Islands. (b) The Convention shall not apply to Aden and the Protectorate of South Arabia; Brunei; Southern Rhodesia; and Tonga, whose consent to the application of the Convention has been withheld
	29 Mar 1966	(a) The Convention shall apply to the following non-metropolitan territories for the international relations of which the United Kingdom is responsible:Antigua, Bahamas, Barbados, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Cayman Islands, Channel Islands, Dominica, Falkland Islands, Fiji, Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Hong Kong, Isle of Man, Mauritius, Montserrat, St. Helena, St. Kitts, St. Lucia, St . Vincent, Seychelles, Swaziland, Turks and Caicos Islands, Virgin Islands (b) The Convention shall not apply to Aden and the Protectorate of South Arabia; Brunei; Southern Rhodesia; and Tonga, whose consent to the application of the Convention has been withheld

---

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Session, Supplement No. 21* (A/2890), p. 49.

[2] See note 1 under “Germany” regarding Berlin (West) in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See note 1 under “Netherlands” regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] With a territorial application to Tokelau.

[6] See note 2 under “United Kingdom of Great Britain and Norhtern Ireland” regarding Hong Kong in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] In regard to the declaration made by Tunisia upon accession, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the following State, the following communication on the date indicated hereinafter:

Netherlands (6 June 2001):

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the above mentioned declaration. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands understands the declaration of Tunisia, in particular with regard to the grounds mentioned in Nos. 4 and 6 of the declaration, in respect of article 8 to extend the grounds on which a person can be deprived of Tunisian nationality.

The declaration therefore restricts one of the essential obligations of the Convention in a way contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid declaration made by the Government of the Republic of Tunisia.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Republic of Tunisia."

5. PROTOCOL RELATING TO THE STATUS OF REFUGEES

New York, 31 January 1967

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 4 October 1967, in accordance with article VIII.
REGISTRATION: 4 October 1967, No. 8791.
STATUS: Parties: 144.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 606, p. 267.

Note: On the recommendation of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the High Commissioner submitted the draft of the above-mentioned Protocol to the General Assembly of the United Nations, through the Economic and Social Council, in the addendum to his report concerning measures to extend the personal scope of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees. The Economic and Social Council, in resolution 1186 (XLI)[1] of 18 November 1966, took note with approval of the draft Protocol and transmitted the said addendum to the General Assembly. The General Assembly, in resolution 2198 (XXI)[2] of 16 December 1966, took note of the Protocol and requested the Secretary-General "to transmit the text of the Protocol to the States mentioned in article V thereof, with a view to enabling them to accede to the Protocol."

Participant	*Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Afghanistan	30 Aug 2005 a
Albania	18 Aug 1992 a
Algeria	8 Nov 1967 a
Angola	23 Jun 1981 a
Antigua and Barbuda	7 Sep 1995 a
Argentina	6 Dec 1967 a
Armenia	6 Jul 1993 a
Australia[3,4]	13 Dec 1973 a
Austria	5 Sep 1973 a
Azerbaijan	12 Feb 1993 a
Bahamas	15 Sep 1993 a
Belarus	23 Aug 2001 a
Belgium	8 Apr 1969 a
Belize	27 Jun 1990 a
Benin	6 Jul 1970 a
Bolivia	9 Feb 1982 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[5]	1 Sep 1993 d
Botswana	6 Jan 1969 a
Brazil	7 Apr 1972 a
Bulgaria	12 May 1993 a
Burkina Faso	18 Jun 1980 a
Burundi	15 Mar 1971 a
Cambodia	15 Oct 1992 a
Cameroon	19 Sep 1967 a
Canada	4 Jun 1969 a
Cape Verde	9 Jul 1987 a
Central African Republic	30 Aug 1967 a
Chad	19 Aug 1981 a
Chile	27 Apr 1972 a
China[6]	24 Sep 1982 a
Colombia	4 Mar 1980 a
Congo	10 Jul 1970 a
Costa Rica	28 Mar 1978 a
Côte d'Ivoire	16 Feb 1970 a
Croatia[5]	12 Oct 1992 d
Cyprus	9 Jul 1968 a
Czech Republic[7]	11 May 1993 d
Democratic Republic of the Congo	13 Jan 1975 a
Denmark[4]	29 Jan 1968 a
Djibouti	9 Aug 1977 d
Dominica	17 Feb 1994 a
Dominican Republic	4 Jan 1978 a
Ecuador	6 Mar 1969 a
Egypt	22 May 1981 a
El Salvador	28 Apr 1983 a
Equatorial Guinea	7 Feb 1986 a
Estonia	10 Apr 1997 a
Ethiopia	10 Nov 1969 a
Fiji	12 Jun 1972 d
Finland	10 Oct 1968 a
France[4]	3 Feb 1971 a
Gabon	28 Aug 1973 a
Gambia	29 Sep 1967 a
Georgia	9 Aug 1999 a
Germany[8,9]	5 Nov 1969 a
Ghana	30 Oct 1968 a
Greece	7 Aug 1968 a
Guatemala	22 Sep 1983 a
Guinea	16 May 1968 a
Guinea-Bissau	11 Feb 1976 a

Participant	*Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Haiti	25 Sep 1984 a
Holy See	8 Jun 1967 a
Honduras	23 Mar 1992 a
Hungary	14 Mar 1989 a
Iceland	26 Apr 1968 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	28 Jul 1976 a
Ireland	6 Nov 1968 a
Israel	14 Jun 1968 a
Italy	26 Jan 1972 a
Jamaica	30 Oct 1980 a
Japan	1 Jan 1982 a
Kazakhstan	15 Jan 1999 a
Kenya	13 Nov 1981 a
Kyrgyzstan	8 Oct 1996 a
Latvia	31 Jul 1997 a
Lesotho	14 May 1981 a
Liberia	27 Feb 1980 a
Liechtenstein	20 May 1968 a
Lithuania	28 Apr 1997 a
Luxembourg	22 Apr 1971 a
Malawi	10 Dec 1987 a
Mali	2 Feb 1973 a
Malta	15 Sep 1971 a
Mauritania	5 May 1987 a
Mexico	7 Jun 2000 a
Montenegro	10 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	20 Apr 1971 a
Mozambique	1 May 1989 a
Namibia	17 Feb 1995 a
Netherlands[4,10]	29 Nov 1968 a
New Zealand	6 Aug 1973 a
Nicaragua	28 Mar 1980 a
Niger	2 Feb 1970 a
Nigeria	2 May 1968 a
Norway	28 Nov 1967 a
Panama	2 Aug 1978 a
Papua New Guinea	17 Jul 1986 a
Paraguay	1 Apr 1970 a
Peru	15 Sep 1983 a
Philippines	22 Jul 1981 a
Poland	27 Sep 1991 a
Portugal[6]	13 Jul 1976 a
Republic of Korea	3 Dec 1992 a
Republic of Moldova	31 Jan 2002 a
Romania	7 Aug 1991 a
Russian Federation	2 Feb 1993 a
Rwanda	3 Jan 1980 a
Samoa	29 Nov 1994 a
Sao Tome and Principe	1 Feb 1978 a
Senegal	3 Oct 1967 a
Serbia[5]	12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles	23 Apr 1980 a
Sierra Leone	22 May 1981 a
Slovakia[7]	4 Feb 1993 d
Slovenia[5]	6 Jul 1992 d
Solomon Islands	12 Apr 1995 a
Somalia	10 Oct 1978 a
South Africa	12 Jan 1996 a
Spain	14 Aug 1978 a
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	3 Nov 2003 a
Sudan	23 May 1974 a
Suriname[11]	29 Nov 1978 d
Swaziland	28 Jan 1969 a
Sweden	4 Oct 1967 a
Switzerland	20 May 1968 a
Tajikistan	7 Dec 1993 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[5]	18 Jan 1994 d
Timor-Leste	7 May 2003 a
Togo	1 Dec 1969 a
Trinidad and Tobago	10 Nov 2000 a
Tunisia	16 Oct 1968 a
Turkey	31 Jul 1968 a
Turkmenistan	2 Mar 1998 a
Tuvalu	7 Mar 1986 d
Uganda	27 Sep 1976 a
Ukraine	4 Apr 2002 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[4]	4 Sep 1968 a
United Republic of Tanzania	4 Sep 1968 a
United States of America	1 Nov 1968 a
Uruguay	22 Sep 1970 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	19 Sep 1986 a
Yemen[12]	18 Jan 1980 a
Zambia	24 Sep 1969 a
Zimbabwe	25 Aug 1981 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon accession or succession.)

ANGOLA

The Government of Angola, in accordance with article VII, paragraph 1, declares that it does not consider itself bound by article IV of the Protocol, concerning settlement of disputes relating to the interpretation of the Protocol.

BOTSWANA

"Subject to the reservation in respect of article IV of the said Protocol and in respect of the application in accordance with article I thereof of the provisions of articles 7, 17, 26, 31, 32 and 34 and paragraph 1 of article 12 of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, done at Geneva on 28 July 1951."

BURUNDI

In acceding to this Protocol, the Government of the Republic of Burundi enters the following reservations:

1. The provisions of article 22 are accepted, in respect of elementary education, only
   (a) In so far as they apply to public education, and not to private education;
   (b) On the understanding that the treatment applicable to refugees shall be the most favourable accorded to nationals of other States.
2. The provisions of article 17 (1) and (2) are accepted as mere recommendations and, in any event, shall not be interpreted as necessarily involving the régime accorded to nationals of countries with which the Republic of Burundi may have concluded regional, customs, economic or political agreements.
3. The provisions of article 26 are accepted only subject to the reservation that refugees:
   (a) Do not choose their place of residence in a region bordering on their country of origin;
   (b) Refrain, in any event, when exercising their right to move freely, from any activity or incursion of a subversive nature with respect to the country of which they are nationals.

CAPE VERDE

In all cases where the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees grants to refugees the most favorable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country, this provision shall not be interpreted as involving the régime accorded to nationals of countries with which Cape Verde has concluded regional customs, economic or political agreements.

CHILE

[See chapter V.2.]

CHINA

With a reservation in respect of article 4.

CONGO

The Protocol is accepted with the exception of article IV.

EL SALVADOR

With the reservation that the Government of El Salvador will not apply article 4 of the Protocol.

ETHIOPIA

[See chapter V.2.]

FINLAND

[See chapter V.2.]

GHANA

"The Government of Ghana does not consider itself bound by article IV of the Protocol regarding the settlement of disputes."

GUATEMALA[13]

HONDURAS

With respect to article I (1):

The Government of the Republic of Honduras does not consider itself bound by those articles of the Convention to which it has entered reservations.

ISRAEL

"The Government of Israel accedes to the Protocol subject to the same statements and reservations made at the time of ratifying the Convention [relating to the Status of Refugees, done at Geneva on 28 July 1951], in accordance with the provisions of article VII (2) of the Protocol."

JAMAICA

"[Subject] to the reservations set out below, ... [:]

1. The Government of Jamaica understands articles 8 and 9 of the Convention as not preventing it from taking, in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances, measures in the interest of national security in the case of a refugee on the ground of his nationality.
2. The Government of Jamaica can only undertake that the provisions of paragraph 2 of article 17 of the Convention will be applied so far as the law of Jamaica allows.
3. The Government of Jamaica can only undertake that the provisions of article 24 of the Convention will be applied so far as the law of Jamaica allows.
4. The Government of Jamaica can only undertake that the provisions of paragraphs l, 2, and 3 of article 25 of the Convention will be applied so far as the law of Jamaica allows.
5. The Government of Jamaica does not accept the obligation imposed by article IV of the Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees with regard to the settlement of disputes."

LATVIA

"Declaration

In accordance with paragraph 2 of the article VII of the [said Protocol], the Republic of Latvia declares that the reservations made in accordance with article 41 of the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees of 1951 are applicable in relation to the obligations under the Protocol."

[See chapter V.2.]

LUXEMBOURG

[See chapter V.2.]

MALAWI

"The Government of the Republic of Malawi reiterates its declaration on recognition as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice made on 12 December, 1966 in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the Court. In this respect, the Government of the Republic of Malawi regards the phrase `settled by other means' in Article 38 of the Convention and Article IV of the Protocol to be those means stipulated in Article 33 of the Charter of the United Nations."

MALTA

In accordance with article VII (2), the reservations to the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees of 28 July 1951 by the Government of Malta on deposit of its instrument of accession on 17 June 1971, pursuant to article 42 of the said Convention, are applicable in relation to its obligations under the present Protocol.

NETHERLANDS[10]

"In accordance with article VII of the Protocol, all reservations made by the Kingdom of the Netherlands upon signature and ratification of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, which was signed in Geneva on 28 July 1951, are regarded to apply to the obligations resulting from the Protocol."

PERU

[The Government of Peru] hereby expressly declares, with reference to the provisions of article I, paragraph 1, and article II of the aforementioned Protocol, that compliance with the obligations undertaken by virtue of the act of accession to that instrument shall be ensured by the Peruvian State using all the means at its disposal, and the Government of Peru shall endeavour in all cases to co-operate as far as possible with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

PORTUGAL

"1. The Protocol will be applied without any geographical limitation.

2. In all cases in which the Protocol confers upon the refugees the most favoured person status granted to nationals of a foreign country, this clause will not be interpreted in such a way as to mean the status granted by Portugal to the nationals of Brazil or to the nationals of other countries with whom Portugal may establish commonwealth type relations."

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

"The Republic of Korea declares pursuant to article 7 of the Protocol that it is not bound by article 7 of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, which provides for the exemption of refugees from legislative reciprocity after fulfilling the condition of three years' residence in the territory of the Contracting States."

RWANDA

Reservation to article IV:

For the settlement of any dispute between States Parties, recourse may be had to the International Court of Justice only with the prior agreement of the Rwandese Republic.

SOMALIA

[See chapter V.2.]

ST. VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES

Reservation:

"In accordance with the provisions of Article VII paragraph 1 of the aforesaid Protocol, however, the Government of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines makes a reservation with respect to Articles IV of the Protocol that, for the submission of any dispute in terms of that article to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the express consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each case."

SWAZILAND

Subject to the following reservations in respect of the application of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, done at Geneva on 28 July 1951, under article I of the Protocol:

"(1) The Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland is not in a position to assume obligations as contained in article 22 of the said Convention, and therefore will not consider itself bound by the provisions therein;

(2) Similarly, the Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland is not in a position to assume the obligations of article 34 of the said Convention, and must expressly reserve the right not to apply the provisions therein."

Declaration:

"The Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland deems it essential to draw attention to the accession as a Member of the United Nations, and not as a Party to the [Convention relating to the Status of Refugees] by reason of succession or otherwise."

TIMOR-LESTE

Declaration:

"In conformity with Article VII and I of the Protocol, the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste accedes to the Protocol, with the understanding that it has made reservations to Articles 16 (2), 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24 of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on the 28 July, 1951."

TURKEY

The instrument of accession stipulates that the Government of Turkey maintains the provisions of the declaration made under section B of article 1 of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, done at Geneva on 28 July 1951, according to which it applies the Convention only to persons who have become refugees as a result of events occurring in Europe, and also the reservation clause made upon ratification of the Convention to the effect that no provision of this Convention may be interpreted as granting to refugees greater rights than those accorded to Turkish citizens in Turkey.

UGANDA

[See chapter V.2.]

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"(a) In accordance with the provisions of the first sentence of Article VII.4 of the Protocol, the United Kingdom hereby excludes from the application of the

Protocol the following territories for the international relations of which it is responsible: Jersey, Southern Rhodesia, Swaziland.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of the second sentence of Article VII.4 of the said Protocol, the United Kingdom hereby extends the application of the Protocol to the following territories for the international relations of which it is responsible: St. Lucia, Montserrat."

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

"Subject to the reservation, hereby made, that the provisions of Article IV of the Protocol shall not be applicable to the United Republic of Tanzania except within the explicit consent of the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

With the following reservations in respect of the application, in accordance with article I of the Protocol, of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, done at New York on 28 July 1951:

"The United States of America construes Article 29 of the Convention as applying only to refugees who are resident in the United States and reserves the right to tax refugees who are not residents of the United States in accordance with its general rules relating to non-resident aliens.

The United States of America accepts the obligation of paragraph 1 (b) of Article 24 of the Convention except insofar as that paragraph may conflict in certain instances with any provisions of title II (old age, survivors' and disability insurance) or title XVIII (hospital and medical insurance for the aged) of the Social Security Act. As to any such provision, the United States will accord to refugees lawfully staying in its territory treatment no less favorable than is accorded aliens generally in the same circumstances."

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

In implementing the provisions of the Protocol which confer on refugees the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country, it shall be understood that such treatment does not include any rights and benefits which Venezuela has granted or may grant regarding entry into or sojourn in Venezuela territory to nationals of countries with which Venezuela has concluded regional or subregional integration, customs, economic or political agreements.

The instrument of accession also contains a reservation in respect of article IV.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon accession or succession.)

BELGIUM

[See chapter V.2.]

ETHIOPIA

[See chapter V.2.]

FRANCE

[See chapter V.2.]

GERMANY[8]

[See chapter V.2.]

ITALY

[See chapter V.2.]

LUXEMBOURG

[See chapter V.2.]

NETHERLANDS

[See chapter V.2.]

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Netherlands[4]	29 Jul 1971	Suriname
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[4,14]	20 Apr 1970	Bahama Islands
	20 Feb 1996	Jersey

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-first Session, Supplement No. 1A* (E/4264/Add.1), p. 1.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Supplement No. 16* (A/6316), p. 48.

[3] With the following declaration: "The Government of Australia will not extend the provisions of the Protocol to Papua/New Guinea."

[4] In accordance with article VII (4) of the Protocol, declarations made under article 40, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Convention (territorial application) by a State Party thereto which accedes to the Protocol shall be deemed to apply in respect of the Protocol, unless upon accession a notification to the contrary is addressed by the State Party to the Secretary-General. See Chapter V-2.

[5] The former Yugoslavia had acceeded to the Protocol on 15 January 1968. See also note 1 under “Bosnia and Herzegovina”, “Croatia”, “former Yugoslavia”, “Slovenia”, “The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” and “Yugoslavia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] On 27 April 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General that the Protocol would apply to Macao. Subsequently, on 18 November and 3 December 1999, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Macao from the Governments of Portugal and China (see also note 3 under “China” and note 1 under “Portugal” regarding Macao in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with the reservation made by China will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[7] Czechoslovakia had acceeded to the Protocol on 26 November 1991. See also note 1 under “Czech Republic” and note 1 under “Slovakia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Protocol on 4 September 1990. See also note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] See note 1 under “Germany” regarding Berlin (West) in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] The Kingdom of the Netherlands accedes to the said Protocol so far as the territory of the Kingdom situated in Europe is concerned; and, as from 1 January 1986, for Aruba.

[11] Upon notifying its succession (29 November1978) the Government of Suriname informed the Secretary-General that the Republic of Suriname did not succeed to the reservations formulated on 29 July 1951 by the Netherlands when the Convention and Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees were extended to Suriname.

[12] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 1 under “Yemen” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[13] In a communication received on 26 April 2007, the Government of the Republic of Guatemala notified the Secretary-General that it has decided to withdraw the reservation and declaration made upon accession to the Convention. The text of the reservation and declaration withdrawn reads as follows:

The Republic of Guatemala accedes to the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its Protocol, with the reservation that it will not apply provisions of those instruments in respect of which the Convention allows reservations if those provisions contravene constitutional precepts in Guatemala or norms of public order under domestic law.

The expression "treatment as favourable as possible" in all articles of the Convention and of the Protocol in which the expression is used should be interpreted as not including rights which, under law or treaty, the Republic of Guatemala has accorded or is according to nationals of the Central American countries or of other countries with which it has concluded or is entering into agreements of a regional nature.

[14] Subject to the reservation which was formulated on behalf of the Bahama Islands in respect of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees.

CHAPTER VI

NARCOTIC DRUGS AND PSYCHOTROPIC SUBSTANCES

1. PROTOCOL AMENDING THE AGREEMENTS, CONVENTIONS AND PROTOCOLS ON NARCOTIC DRUGS, CONCLUDED AT THE HAGUE ON 23 JANUARY 1912, AT GENEVA ON 11 FEBRUARY 1925 AND 19 FEBRUARY 1925, AND 13 JULY 1931, AT BANGKOK ON 27 NOVEMBER 1931 AND AT GENEVA ON 26 JUNE 1936

Lake Success, New York, 11 December 1946

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 11 December 1946, in accordance with article VII(1).
REGISTRATION: 3 February 1948, No. 186.
STATUS: Signatories: 23. Parties: 62.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 12, p. 179.

Note: The Protocol was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 54 (I)[1]of 19 November 1946.

In accordance with its article 44 (1), the provisions of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narocitc Drugs, 1961 of 8 August 1975, as between the parties thereto, terminates and replaces the provisions of the above Protocol, except as it affects the Convention listed under No. VI-11. See chapter VI.18.

The amendments set forth in the annex to the Protocol came into force on the dates indicated in respect of the Agreements and Conventions listed below as follows in accordance with paragraph 2 of article VII of the Protocol:[2]

27 Oct 1947	Agreement concerning the Suppression of the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in, and Use of, Prepared Opium (with Protocol, signed at Geneva on 11 February 1925
3 Feb 1948	International Opium Convention (with Protocol), signed at Geneva on 19 February 1925
21 Nov 1947	Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs (with Protocol of Signature), signed at Geneva on 13 July 1931
27 Oct 1947	Agreement concerning the Suppression of Opium Smoking, signed at Bangkok on 27 November 1931
10 Oct 1947	Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs, signed at Geneva on 26 June 1936.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature(s), Acceptance(A), Succession(d)*
Afghanistan		11 Dec 1946 s
Albania		23 Jun 1947 A
Argentina		11 Dec 1946 s
Australia	11 Dec 1946	28 Aug 1947 A
Austria		17 May 1950 A
Bahamas		13 Aug 1975 d
Belarus		11 Dec 1946 s
Belgium		11 Dec 1946 s
Bolivia		11 Dec 1946 s
Brazil		17 Dec 1946 s
Canada		11 Dec 1946 s
Chile		11 Dec 1946 s
China[3]		11 Dec 1946 s
Colombia		11 Dec 1946 s
Costa Rica[4]	11 Dec 1946	
Cuba	12 Dec 1946	
Czech Republic[5]		30 Dec 1993 d
Denmark[4]	11 Dec 1946	15 Jun 1949 A

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature(s), Acceptance(A), Succession(d)*
Dominican Republic		11 Dec 1946 s
Ecuador	13 Dec 1946	8 Jun 1951 A
Egypt[4]	11 Dec 1946	13 Sep 1948 A
Fiji		1 Nov 1971 d
Finland		3 Feb 1948 A
France[4]	11 Dec 1946	10 Oct 1947 A
Germany[6,7]		12 Aug 1959 A
Greece[4]	11 Dec 1946	21 Feb 1949 A
Guatemala[4]	13 Dec 1946	
Haiti	14 Dec 1946	31 May 1951 A
Honduras		11 Dec 1946 s
Hungary		16 Dec 1955 A
India		11 Dec 1946 s
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		11 Dec 1946 s
Iraq[4]	12 Dec 1946	14 Sep 1950 A
Ireland		18 Feb 1948 A
Italy		25 Mar 1948 s
Japan		27 Mar 1952 A
Lebanon		13 Dec 1946 s
Liberia		11 Dec 1946 s
Liechtenstein[8]		25 Sep 1947 A
Luxembourg[4]	11 Dec 1946	13 Oct 1949 A
Mexico		11 Dec 1946 s
Monaco		21 Nov 1947 s
Netherlands[4]	[11 Dec 1946]	[10 Mar 1948 A]
New Zealand[9]		11 Dec 1946 s
Nicaragua	13 Dec 1946	24 Apr 1950 A
Norway[4]	11 Dec 1946	2 Jul 1947 A
Panama		15 Dec 1946 s
Papua New Guinea		28 Oct 1980 d
Paraguay	14 Dec 1946	
Peru	26 Nov 1948	26 Nov 1948 A
Philippines[4]	11 Dec 1946	25 May 1950 A
Poland		11 Dec 1946 s
Romania		11 Oct 1961 A
Russian Federation	11 Dec 1946	25 Oct 1947 A
Saudi Arabia		11 Dec 1946 s
Serbia[10]		12 Mar 2001 d
Slovakia[5]		28 May 1993 d
South Africa	15 Dec 1946	24 Feb 1948 A
Spain		26 Sep 1955 s
Sweden		17 Oct 1947 s
Switzerland[8]		25 Sep 1947 A
Syrian Arab Republic		11 Dec 1946 s
Thailand		27 Oct 1947 s
Turkey		11 Dec 1946 s
Ukraine	11 Dec 1946	8 Jan 1948 A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland		11 Dec 1946 s
United States of America	11 Dec 1946	12 Aug 1947 A
Uruguay	14 Dec 1946	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	11 Dec 1946	

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Part of the First Session, Resolutions (A/64/Add.1),* p. 81.

[2] The Protocol does not contain any formal amendment in respect of the Convention of 23 January 1912. However, its article III provides as follows:

"The functions conferred upon the Netherlands Government under articles 21 and 25 of the International Opium Convention signed at The Hague on 23 January 1912, and entrusted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations with the consent of the Netherlands Government, by a resolution of the League of Nations Assembly dated 15 December 1920, shall henceforward be exercised by the Secretary-General of the United Nations."

The Convention of 23 January 1912 (which, consequently, was amended in effect by the Protocol of 11 December 1946) has been included in the present chapter.

[3] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[4] The signature was affixed without reservation as to approval, but the full powers provided for signature subject to this reservation.

[5] Czechoslovakia had signed the Protocol, definitively, on 11 December 1946. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under “Germany” regarding Berlin (West) in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] The instrument of acceptance of the Protocol by the Government of the Swiss Confederation stipulates that the declaration of acceptance is also valid for the Principality of Liechtenstein.

[9] See note 1 under “New Zealand” regarding Tokelau in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] The former Yugoslavia had signed and accepted the Protocol on 11 December 1946 and 19 May 1948, respectively (the signature had been affixed without reservation as to approval, but the full powers provided for signature subject to this reservation). See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. INTERNATIONAL OPIUM CONVENTION

The Hague, 23 January 1912

REGISTRATION: 23 January 1922, No. 222.[1]

Note: Observation [2]: This Convention, although not concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations, served as a starting-point for the system devised by the League of Nations and has, in a sense, been incorporated in that system.

Schedule containing the signatures of the Convention, the signatures of the Protocol of Signature of the Powers not represented at the First Opium Conference, provided for in the penultimate paragraph of Article 22 of the Convention, the ratifications of the Convention, and the signatures of the Protocol respecting the putting into force of the Convention provided under "B" of the Final Protocol of the Third International Opium Conference.

In accordance with its article 44 (1), the provisions of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narocitc Drugs, 1961 of 8 August 1975, as between the parties thereto, terminates and replaces the provisions of the above Convention. See chapter VI.18.

[The ratifications and signatures in accordance with Article 295 of the Peace Treaty of Versailles or in accordance with a similar article of other treaties of peace are marked with an asterisk (*).][3,4]

Participant	*Signatures of the Convention*	*Signatures of the Protocol of the Powers not represeted at the Opium Conference*	*Ratification of the Convention and accessions*	*Signatures of the Protocol relative to the bringing into force of the Convention (dates of the entry into force)*
Afghanistan			May 5, 1944	
Albania		Feb 3, 1925	Feb 3, 1925	Feb 3, 1925
Argentina		Oct 17, 1912	Apr 23, 1946	
Austria			Jul 16, 1920*	Jul 16, 1920*
Belgian Congo and Mandated Territory of Ruanda-Urundi (a)			Jul 29, 1942	
Belgium[5]		Jun 18, 1912	Jun 16, 1914	May 14, 1919
Bolivia		Jun 4, 1913	Jan 10, 1920*	Jan 10, 1920*
Brazil		Oct 16, 1912	Dec 23, 1914	Jan 10, 1920*
Bulgaria		Mar 2, 1914	Aug 9, 1920*	Aug 9, 1920*
Burma[6]				
Chile		Jul 2, 1913	Jan 16, 1923	May 18, 1923
China[7]	Jan 23, 1912		Feb 9, 1914	Feb 11, 1915
Colombia[8]		Jan 15, 1913	Jun 26, 1924	Jun 30, 1924
Costa Rica		Apr 25, 1912	Aug 1, 1924	Jul 29, 1925
Cuba		May 8, 1913	Mar 8, 1920*	Mar 8, 1920*
Czechoslovakia[9]			Jan 10, 1920*	Jan 10, 1920*
Denmark[10]		Dec 17, 1912	Jul 10, 1913	Oct 21, 1921
Dominican Republic		Nov 12, 1912	Jun 7, 1923	Apr 14, 1931
Ecuador		Jul 2, 1912	Feb 25, 1915	Aug 23, 1923

Participant	*Signatures of the Convention*	*Signatures of the Protocol of the Powers not represeted at the Opium Conference*	*Ratification of the Convention and accessions*	*Signatures of the Protocol relative to the bringing into force of the Convention (dates of the entry into force)*
Egypt			Jun 5, 1942	
Estonia		Jan 9, 1923	Apr 20, 1923	Jan 21, 1931
Finland		Apr 24, 1922	May 16, 1922	Dec 1, 1922
France[11]	Jan 23, 1912		Jan 10, 1920*	Jan 10, 1920*
Germany	Jan 23, 1912		Jan 10, 1920*	Jan 10, 1920*
Great Britain[12]	Jan 23, 1912		Jul 15, 1914	Jan 10, 1920*
Greece			Mar 30, 1920*	Mar 30, 1920*
Guatemala		Jun 17, 1912	Aug 27, 1913	Jan 10, 1920*
Haiti		Aug 21, 1912	Jun 30, 1920*	Jun 30, 1920*
Honduras		Jul 5, 1912	Aug 29, 1913	Apr 3, 1915
Hungary			Jul 26, 1921*	Jul 26, 1921*
Iran[13]	Jan 23, 1912			
Italy	Jan 23, 1912		Jun 28, 1914	10 janv 1920*
Japan	Jan 23, 1912		Jan 10, 1920*	Jan 10, 1920*
Latvia		Feb 6, 1922	Mar 25, 1924	Jan 18, 1932
Liberia			Jun 30, 1920*	Jun 30, 1920*
Liechtenstein[14]				
Lithuania		Apr 7, 1922		
Luxembourg		Jun 18, 1912	Aug 21, 1922	Aug 21, 1922
Mexico		May 15, 1912	Apr 2, 1925	May 8, 1925
Monaco		May 1, 1923	Feb 20, 1925	May 26, 1925
Netherlands	Jan 23, 1912		Jul 28, 1914	Feb 11, 1915
Nicaragua	Jan 23, 1912	Jul 18, 1913	Nov 10, 1914	Nov 3 1920
Norway		Sep 2, 1913	Nov 12, 1914	Sep 20, 1915
Panama		Jun 19, 1912	Nov 25, 1920*	Nov 25, 1920*
Paraguay		Dec 14, 1912	Mar 17, 1943	
Peru		Jul 24, 1913	Jan 10, 1920*	Jan 10, 1920*
Poland			Jan 10, 1920*	Jan 10, 1920*
Portugal	Jan 23, 1912		Dec 15, 1913	. Apr. 8, . 1920*
Romania		Dec 27, 1913	Sep 14, 1920*	Sep 14, 1920*
Russia	Jan 23, 1912			
Salvador		Jul 30, 1912	Sep 19, 1922	May 29, 1931
Saudi Arabia			Feb 19, 1943	
Spain		Oct 23, 1912	Jan 25, 1919	Feb 11, 1921
Sweden[15]		Aug 27, 1913	Apr 17, 1914	Jan 13, 1921
Switzerland[16]		Dec 29, 1913	Jan 15, 1925	Jan 15, 1925
Thailand[17]	Jan 23, 1912		Jul 10, 1913	Jan 10, 1920*
Turkey	Sep 15, 1933		Sep 15, 1933	Sep 15, 1933
United States of America	Jan 23, 1912		Dec 15, 1913	Feb 11, 1915
Uruguay		Mar 9, 1914	Apr 3, 1916	Jan 10, 1920*
Venezuela		Sep 10, 1912	Oct 28, 1913	Jul 12, 1927
Yugoslavia (former)[18]			Feb 10, 1920*	Feb 10, 1920*

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[19,20]	*Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Bahamas	13 Aug 1975 d
Cambodia[19]	3 Oct 1951 d
Cameroon	20 Nov 1961 d
Central African Republic	4 Sep 1962 d
Congo	15 Oct 1962 d
Côte d'Ivoire	8 Dec 1961 d
Cyprus	16 May 1963 d
Czech Republic[9]	30 Dec 1993 d
Democratic Republic of the Congo	31 May 1962 d
Ethiopia	28 Dec 1948 a
Fiji	1 Nov 1971 d
Ghana	3 Apr 1958 d
Indonesia	29 May 1958 a
Israel	12 May 1952 a
Jamaica	26 Dec 1963 d
Jordan	12 May 1958 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic	7 Oct 1950 d
Lebanon	24 May 1954 d
Lesotho	4 Nov 1974 d
Malawi	22 Jul 1965 d
Malaysia	21 Aug 1958 d
Malta	3 Jan 1966 d
Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 d
Niger	25 Aug 1961 d
Nigeria	26 Jun 1961 d
Papua New Guinea	28 Oct 1980 d
Philippines	30 Sep 1959 d
Senegal	2 May 1963 d
Serbia	31 Jul 2002 d
Sierra Leone	13 Mar 1962 d
Slovakia[9]	28 May 1993 d
Sri Lanka	4 Dec 1957 d
Syrian Arab Republic	20 Jan 1954 d
Trinidad and Tobago	11 Apr 1966 d
Zambia	9 Apr 1973 d

Notes:

[1] See League of Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 8, p. 187.

[2] The Protocol does not contain any formal amendment in respect of the Convention of 23 January 1912. However, its article III provides as follows:

"The functions conferred upon the Netherlands Government under articles 21 and 25 of the International Opium Convention signed at The Hague on 23 January 1912, and entrusted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations with the consent of the Netherlands Government, by a resolution of the League of Nations Assembly dated 15 December 1920, shall henceforward be exercised by the Secretary-General of the United Nations."

The Convention of 23 January 1912 (which, consequently, was amended in effect by the Protocol of 11 December 1946) has been included in the present chapter.

[3] This Schedule which appeared in the Annexes to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League is reproduced here for purposes of information.

[4] The Convention came into force initially on 11 February 1915, in accordance with the provisions of the Protocol respecting the putting into force of the Convention.

[5] Subject to adherence or denunciation as regards the Belgian Congo.

[6] See note 1 under "Myanmar" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (see note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[8] Subject to approval of the Colombian Parliament.

[9] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] The signature of the Protocol of Signature of the Powers not represented at the Conference as well as its ratification were given by Denmark for Iceland and the Danish Antilles: the signature of the Protocol respecting the putting into force of the Convention was given by Denmark and Iceland.

[11] With the reservation that a separate and special ratification or denunciation may subsequently be obtained for the French Protectorates. France and Great Britain signed the Convention for the New Hebrides, August 21st, 1924.

[12] Subject to the following declaration:

The articles of the present Convention, if ratified by His Britannic Majesty's Government, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, Hong-Kong, and Wei-Hai-Wei in every respect in the same way as they shall apply to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland: but His Britannic Majesty's Government reserve the right of signing or denouncing separately the said Convention in the name of any Dominion, Colony, Dependency, or Protectorate of His Majesty other than those which have been specified.

In virtue of the above-mentioned reservation, Great Britain signed the Convention for the following Dominions, Colonies, Dependencies, and Protectorates: on December 17th, 1912, for Canada, Newfound- land, New Zealand, Brunei, Cyprus, the East Africa Protectorate, Falkland Islands, Malay Protectorates, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gold Coast, Jamaica, Johore, Kedah, Kelantan Perlis, Trengganu, Malta, Northern Nigeria, Northern Borneo, Nyasaland, St. Helena, Sarawak, Seychelles, Somaliland, Southern Nigeria, Trinidad, Uganda; on February 27th, 1913, for the Colony of Fiji; on April 22nd, 1913, for the Colony of Sierra Leone, the Gilbert and Ellice Islands Protectorate and the Solomon Islands Protectorate; on June 25th, 1913, for the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia; on November 14th, 1913, for the Bahama Islands and for the three Colonies of the Windward Islands, that is to say, Grenada, St. Lucia and St. Vincent; on January 30th, 1914, for the Leeward Islands; on February 11th, 1914, for British Guiana as well as for British Honduras; on March 28th, 1914, for the Government of the Union of South Africa; on March 28th, 1914, for Zanzibar, Southern and Northern Rhodesia, Basutoland, the Bechuanaland Protectorate and Swaziland;on April 4th, 1914, for the Colony of Barbados; on April 8th, 1914, for Mauritius and its dependencies; on July 11th, 1914, for the Bermuda Islands; on August 21st, 1924, for Palestine and together with France for the Newbrides; on October 20th, 1914, for Iraq.

[13] With the reservation of articles 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 (Iran having no treaty with China) and paragraph (a) of article 3.

[14] The Netherlands Minister for Foreign Affairs, by a letter dated October 14th, 1936, transmitted to the Secretariat, at the request of the Swiss Legation at The Hague, the following declaration:

"Under the terms of the arrangements concluded between the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Swiss Government in 1929 and 1935, in application of the Customs Union Treaty concluded between these two countries on March 29th, 1923, the Swiss legislation on narcotic drugs, including all the measures taken by the Federal authorities to give effect to the different international Conventions on dangerous drugs, will be applicable to the territory of the Principality in the same way as to the territory of the Confederation, as long as the said Treaty remains in force. The Principality of Liechtenstein will accordingly participate, so long as the said Treaty remains in force, in the international Conventions which have been or may hereafter be concluded in the matter of narcotic drugs, it being neither necessary nor advisable for that country to accede to them separately."

[15] Subject to the following declaration:

"Opium not being manufactured in Sweden, the Swedish Government will for the moment confine themselves to prohibiting the importation of prepared opium, but they declare at the same time that they are ready to take the measures indicated in Article 8 of the Convention if experience proves their expediency."

[16] Subject to ratification and with the declaration that the Swiss Government will be unable to issue the necessary legal enactments within the terms fixed by the Convention.

[17] With the reservation of articles 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 (Thailand having no treaty with China).

[18] See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[19] By joint notifications received from the Governments of France and Viet-Nam on 11 August 1950; from the Governments of France and Laos, on 7 October 1950; and from the Governments of France and Cambodia on 3 October 1951, notice was given of the transfer of functions by the French Government to the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam, Laos and Cambodia of the duties and obligations arising from the application of the Convention in these countries. It should be noted that the Republic of Viet-Nam succeeded to the Convention on 11 August 1950. See also note 1 under “Viet Nam” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[20] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as from 16 December 1957.

In this connexion, the Secretary-General received on 16 March 1976 the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 7 February 1974 concerning the application, as from 16 December 1957, of the International Opium Convention of 23 January 1912, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic this declaration has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the International Opium Convention, January 23rd, 1912, to which it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

3. AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE SUPPRESSION OF THE MANUFACTURE OF, INTERNAL TRADE IN, AND USE OF, PREPARED OPIUM

Geneva, 11 February 1925 and Lake Success, New York, 11 December 1946[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 27 October 1947, the date on which the amendments to the Agreement, as set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 11 December 1946 entered into force, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article VII of the Protocol.

Note: *In accordance with its article 44 (1), the provisions of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narocitc Drugs, 1961 of 8 August 1975, as between the parties thereto, terminates and replaces the provisions of the above Agreement. See chapter VI.18.*

Participant[2]	***Definitive signature of the Protocol, Acceptance of the Protocol, Notification in respect of the Agreement as amended(d)***
Cambodia[2]	3 Oct 1951 d
France	10 Oct 1947
India	11 Dec 1946
Japan	27 Mar 1952
Lao People's Democratic Republic	7 Oct 1950 d
Netherlands	10 Mar 1948
Thailand	27 Oct 1947
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	11 Dec 1946

Notes:

[1] The Agreement was amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946.

[2] The Republic of Viet-Nam had succeeded to the Agreement on 11 August 1950. By joint notifications received from the Governments of France and Viet-Nam on 11 August 1950; from the Governments of France and Laos, on 7 October 1950; and from the Governments of France and Cambodia on 3 October 1951, notice was given of the transfer of functions by the French Government to the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam, Laos and Cambodia of the duties and obligations arising from the application of the Convention in these countries. It should be noted that the Republic of Viet-Nam succeeded to the Convention on 11 August 1950. See also note 1 under “Viet Nam” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

4. AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE SUPPRESSION OF THE MANUFACTURE OF, INTERNAL TRADE IN, AND USE OF, PREPARED OPIUM

Geneva, 11 February 1925

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 28 July 1926, in accordance with article 14.
REGISTRATION: 28 July 1926, No. 1239.[1]

Note: *In accordance with its article 44 (1), the provisions of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narocitc Drugs, 1961 of 8 August 1975, as between the parties thereto, terminates and replaces the provisions of the above Agreement. See chapter VI.18.*

Ratifications

British Empire

(February 17th, 1926)

The signature of this Protocol is subject, in respect of British Protectorates, to the conditions contained in Article XIII of the Agreement.

Burma[2]

India

(February 17th, 1926)

France

(April 29th, 1926)

Japan

(October 10th, 1928)

The Netherlands (including the *Netherlands Indies, Surinam,* and *Curaçao*)

(March 1st, 1927)

Portugal

(September 13th, 1926)

While accepting the principle of a monopoly as formulated in Article I, does so, as regards the moment at which the measures provided for in the first paragraph thereof shall come into force, subject to the limitation contained in the second paragraph of the article.

The Portuguese Government, being bound by a contract consistent with the provisions of The Hague Convention of 1912, will not be able to put into operation the provisions of paragraph I of Article VI of the present Agreement so long as its obligations under this contract are in force.

Thailand

(May 6th, 1927)

Under reservation of Article I, paragraph 3 (a), with regard to the time when this provision shall come into force, and of Article V. The reason for these reservations had been stated by the First Delegate of Thailand on November 14th, 1924. The Thai Government is hoping to put into force the system of registration and rationing within the period of three years. After that date, the reservation in regard to Article I, paragraph 3 (a), will fall to the ground.

Notes:

[1] See League of Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 51, p. 337.

[2] See note 1 under "Myanmar" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

5. INTERNATIONAL OPIUM CONVENTION

Geneva, 19 February 1925 and Lake Success, New York, 11 December 1946[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 February 1948, the date on which the amendments to the Convention, as set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 11 December 1946, entered into force, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article VII of the Protocol.

Note: *In accordance with its article 44 (1), the provisions of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narocitc Drugs, 1961 of 8 August 1975, as between the parties thereto, terminates and replaces the provisions of the above Convention. See chapter VI.18.*

Participant[2,3]	*Definitive signature of the Protocol, Acceptance of the Protocol, Succession to the Convention and the Protocol*	*Accession to the Convention as amended(a), Succession to the Convention as amended(d)*
Afghanistan		29 Jan 1957 a
Algeria		31 Oct 1963 a
Argentina	11 Dec 1946	
Australia	28 Aug 1947	
Austria	17 May 1950	
Bahamas	13 Aug 1975	
Belgium	11 Dec 1946	
Benin		5 Dec 1961 d
Bolivia	14 Dec 1946	
Brazil	17 Dec 1946	
Burkina Faso		26 Apr 1963 a
Cambodia		3 Oct 1951 d
Cameroon		20 Nov 1961 d
Canada	11 Dec 1946	
Central African Republic		4 Sep 1962 d
Chile	11 Dec 1946	
Colombia	11 Dec 1946	
Congo		15 Oct 1962 d
Côte d'Ivoire		8 Dec 1961 d
Czech Republic[4]		30 Dec 1993 d
Democratic Republic of the Congo		31 May 1962 d
Denmark	15 Jun 1949	
Dominican Republic	11 Dec 1946	
Ecuador	8 Jun 1951	
Egypt	13 Sep 1948	
Ethiopia		9 Sep 1947 a
Fiji	1 Nov 1971	
Finland	3 Feb 1948	
France	10 Oct 1947	
Germany[5]	12 Aug 1959	
Ghana		7 Apr 1958 d
Greece	21 Feb 1949	
Haiti	31 May 1951	
Honduras	11 Dec 1946	
Hungary	16 Dec 1955	
India	11 Dec 1946	
Indonesia		3 Apr 1958 a
Iraq	14 Sep 1950	
Ireland	18 Feb 1948	
Israel		16 May 1952 a
Italy	25 Mar 1948	
Jamaica		26 Dec 1963 d
Japan	27 Mar 1952	
Jordan		7 May 1958 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		7 Oct 1950 d
Lebanon	13 Dec 1946	
Lesotho		4 Nov 1974 d
Liechtenstein[6]	25 Sep 1947	
Luxembourg	13 Oct 1949	
Malawi		22 Jul 1965 d
Malaysia		21 Aug 1958 d
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 d
Monaco	21 Nov 1947	
Morocco		7 Nov 1956 d
Netherlands	10 Mar 1948	
New Zealand[7]	11 Dec 1946	
Niger		25 Aug 1961 d
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 d

Participant[2,3]	*Definitive signature of the Protocol, Acceptance of the Protocol, Succession to the Convention and the Protocol*		*Accession to the Convention as amended(a), Succession to the Convention as amended(d)*	
Norway	2 Jul	1947		
Papua New Guinea			28 Oct	1980 d
Philippines	17 May	1950		
Poland	11 Dec	1946		
Romania	11 Oct	1961		
Russian Federation	25 Oct	1947		
Rwanda			5 Aug	1964 d
Senegal			2 May	1963 d
Serbia			31 Jul	2002 d
Sierra Leone			13 Mar	1962 d
Slovakia[4]			28 May	1993 d
South Africa	24 Feb	1948		
Spain	26 Sep	1955		
Sri Lanka			4 Dec	1957 d
Sweden	17 Oct	1947		
Switzerland[6]	25 Sep	1947		
Syrian Arab Republic	11 Dec	1946		
Thailand	27 Oct	1947		
Togo			27 Feb	1962 d
Trinidad and Tobago			11 Apr	1966 d
Turkey	11 Dec	1946		
Uganda			20 Oct	1965 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	11 Dec	1946		
Zambia			9 Apr	1973 d

Notes:

[1] The Convention was amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946.

[2] The Republic of Viet-Nam had succeeded to the Convention on 11 August 1950.

By joint notifications received from the Governments of France and Viet-Nam on 11 August 1950; from the Governments of France and Laos, on 7 October 1950; and from the Governments of France and Cambodia on 3 October 1951, notice was given of the transfer of functions by the French Government to the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam, Laos and Cambodia of the duties and obligations arising from the application of the Convention in these countries. It should be noted that the Republic of Viet-Nam succeeded to the Convention on 11 August 1950. See also note 1 under “Viet Nam” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The former Yugoslavia had accepted the Protocol on 19 May 1948. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] Czechoslovakia, by virtue of its definitive signature on 11 December 1946 of the Protocol of 11 December 1946 amending the Convention of 1925, became a party to the Convention on the date of that signature. See also note 1 under “Czech Republic” and note 1 under “Slovakia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] With a declaration of application to the Principality of Liechtenstein.

[7] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

6. a) International Opium Convention

Geneva, 19 February 1925

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 25 September 1928, in accordance with article 36.
REGISTRATION: 25 September 1928, No. 1845.[1]

Note: *In accordance with its article 44 (1), the provisions of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narocitc Drugs, 1961 of 8 August 1975, as between the parties thereto, terminates and replaces the provisions of the above Convention. See chapter VI.18.*

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Argentina
(Apr 18th, 1946)

Austria
(Nov 25th, 1927)

Belgium
(Aug 24th, 1927)

Does not apply to the Belgian Congo or to the territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate.

(Dec 17th, 1941 a)

Bolivia
(Apr 15th, 1932 a)

1. Bolivia does not undertake to restrict the home cultivation or production of coca, or to prohibit the use of coca leaves by the native population.
2. The exportation of coca leaves shall be subject to control by the Bolivian Government, by means of export certificates.
3. The Bolivian Government designates the following as places from which coca may be exported: Villazon, Yacuiba, Antofagasta, Arica and Mollendo.

Brazil
(Jun 10th, 1932)

British Empire
(Feb 17th, 1926)

His Britannic Majesty's ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada or the Irish Free State and, in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 39 of the Convention, the instrument shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Colony of the Bahamas or the State of Sarawak under His Britannic Majesty's protection.

State of Sarawak
(Mar 11th, 1926 a)

Bahamas
(Oct 22nd, 1926 a)

Burma[2]

Canada
(Jun 27th, 1928)

Australia
(Feb 17th, 1926)

New Zealand
(Feb 17th, 1926)

Including the mandated territory of *Western Samoa*

Union of South Africa
(Feb 17th, 1926)

Ireland
(Sep 1st, 1931)

India
(Feb 17th, 1926)

Iraq
(Aug 8th, 1931 a)

Bulgaria
(Mar 9th, 1927)

Chile
(Apr 11th, 1933)

Colombia
(Dec 3rd, 1930 a)

Costa Rica
(Jan 8th, 1935 a)

Cuba
(Jul 6th, 1931)

Czechoslovakia[3]
(Apr 11th, 1927)

Denmark
(Apr 23rd, 1930)

Dominican Republic
(Jul 19th, 1928 a)

Ecuador
(Oct 23rd, 1934 a)

Egypt
(Mar 16th, 1926 a)

Estonia
(Aug 30th, 1930 a)

Finland
(Dec 5th, 1927 a)

France
(Jul 2nd, 1927)

The French Government is compelled to make all reservations, as regards the Colonies, Protectorates and mandated territories under its authority, as to the possibility of regularly producing, within the strictly prescribed time-limit, the quarterly statistics provided for in paragraph 2 of Article 22.

Germany
(Aug 15th, 1929)

Subject to the reservation annexed to the Procès-verbal of the plenary meeting of February 16th, 1925. (The validity of the signature and ratification of this Convention are subject to the condition that a German expert will be appointed as a member of the Central Board.)

Greece
(Dec 10th, 1929)

Haiti (Nov 30th, 1938 a)

Hungary (Aug 27th, 1930)

Honduras (Sep 21st, 1934 a)

Italy (Dec 11th, 1929 a)

(for the Kingdom and Colonies)

Japan (Oct 10th, 1928)

Latvia (Oct 31st, 1928)

Liechtenstein[4]

Lithuania (Feb 13th, 1931 a)

Luxembourg (Mar 27th, 1928)

Monaco (Feb 9th, 1927 a)

Netherlands (Jun 4th, 1928)

(including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao)

Norway (Mar 16th, 1931 a)

New Hebrides (Dec 27th, 1927 a)

Paraguay (Jun 25th, 1941 a)

Poland (Jun 16th, 1927)

Portugal (Sep 13th, 1926)

Romania (May 18th, 1928 a)

Salvador (Dec 2nd, 1926 a)

San Marino (Apr 21st, 1926 a)

Spain (Jun 22nd, 1928)

Includes also the *Spanish Colonies and the Spanish Protectorate of Morocco*

Sudan (Feb 20th, 1926)

Sweden (Dec 6th, 1930 a)

Switzerland[4] (Apr 3rd, 1929)

With reference to the declaration made by the Swiss delegation at the 36th plenary meeting of the Conference concerning the forwarding of the quarterly statistics provided for in Article 22, paragraph 2.

Thailand (Oct 11th, 1929)

Turkey (Apr 3rd, 1933 a)

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (Oct 31st, 1935 a)

Uruguay (Sep 11th, 1930)

Venezuela (Jun 19th, 1929 a)

Yugoslavia (former)[5] (Sep 4th, 1929)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Albania

Iran

Ad referendum and subject to the League of Nations complying with the request made by Iran in the Memorandum O.D.C.24.

Nicaragua

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[6]	***Succession(d)***
Bahamas	13 Aug 1975 d
Czech Republic[3]	30 Dec 1993 d
Fiji	1 Nov 1971 d
Papua New Guinea	28 Oct 1980 d
Slovakia[3]	28 May 1993 d
Tonga	5 Sep 1973 d

Notes:

[1] See League of Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 81, p. 317.

[2] See note 1 under "Myanmar" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] The Swiss Federal Political Department, by a letter dated July 15th, 1936, informed the Secretariat of the following:

"Under the terms of the arrangements concluded between the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Swiss Government in 1929 and 1935, in application of the Customs Union Treaty concluded between these two countries on March 29th, 1923, the Swiss legislation on narcotic drugs, including all the measures taken by the Federal authorities to give effect to the different international Conventions on dangerous drugs, will be applicable to the territory of the Principality in the same way as to the territory of the Confederation, as long as the said Treaty remains in force. The Principality of Liechtenstein will accordingly participate, so long as the said Treaty remains in force, in the international Conventions which have been or may hereafter be concluded in the matter of narcotic drugs, it being neither necessary nor advisable for that country to accede to them separately."

[5] See note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as from 7 April 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received on 16 March 1976 the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974, concerning the application as from 7 April 1958, of the International Opium Convention of 19 February 1925, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic this declaration has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the International Opium Convention, February 19th 1925 to which it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

6. b) Protocol to the International Opium Convention

Geneva, 19 February 1925

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 25 September 1928.
REGISTRATION: 25 September 1928, No. 1845.[1]

Note: In accordance with its article 44 (1), the provisions of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narocitc Drugs, 1961 of 8 August 1975, as between the parties thereto, terminates and replaces the provisions of the above Protocol. See chapter VI.18.

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Argentina
(Apr 18th, 1946)
British Empire
(Feb 17th, 1926)
(Same reservation as for the Convention.)
State of Sarawak
(Mar 11th, 1926 a)
Bahamas
(Oct 22nd, 1926 a)
Burma[2]
Canada
(Jun 27th, 1928)
Australia
(Feb 17th, 1926)
New Zealand
(Feb 17th, 1926)
Union of South Africa
(Feb 17th, 1926)
India
(Feb 17th, 1926)
Iraq
(Aug 8th, 1931 a)
Bolivia
(Apr 15th, 1932 a)
Bulgaria
(Mar 9th, 1927)
Chile
(Apr 11th, 1933)
Colombia
(Dec 3rd, 1930 a)
Costa Rica
(Jan 8th, 1935 a)
Cuba
(Jul 6th, 1931)
Czechoslovakia[3]
(Apr 11th, 1927)
Ecuador
(Oct 23rd, 1934 a)
Egypt

(Mar 16th, 1926 a)
Estonia
(Aug 30th, 1930 a)
Finland
(Dec 5th, 1927 a)
Germany
(Aug 15th, 1929)
Greece
(Dec 10th, 1929)
Haiti
(Nov 30th, 1938 a)
Honduras
(Sep 21st, 1934 a)
Japan
(Oct 10th, 1928)
Latvia
(Oct 31st, 1928)
Luxembourg
(Mar 27th, 1928)
Netherlands
(Jun 4th, 1928)
(*including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao*)
Portugal
(Sep 13th, 1926)
Romania
(May 18th, 1928 a)
Salvador
(Dec 2nd, 1926 a)
Spain
(Apr 19th, 1930 a)
(Feb 20th, 1926)
Thailand
(Oct 11th, 1929)
Turkey
(Apr 3rd, 1933 a)
Venezuela
(Jun 19th, 1929 a)
Yugoslavia (former)[4]
(Sep 4th, 1929)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Albania
Iran
Nicaragua

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Succession(d)*
Bahamas	13 Aug 1975 d
Czech Republic[3]	30 Dec 1993 d
Fiji	1 Nov 1971 d
Papua New Guinea	28 Oct 1980 d
Slovakia[3]	28 May 1993 d
Tonga	5 Sep 1973 d

Notes:

[1] See League of Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 81, p. 317.

[2] See note 1 under "Myanmar" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

7. CONVENTION FOR LIMITING THE MANUFACTURE AND REGULATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS

Geneva, 13 July 1931 and Lake Success, New York, 11 December 1946[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 November 1947, the date on which the amendments to the Convention, as set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 11 December 1946, entered into force, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article VII of the Protocol.

Note: *In accordance with its article 44 (1), the provisions of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narocitc Drugs, 1961 of 8 August 1975, as between the parties thereto, terminates and replaces the provisions of the above Convention. See chapter VI.18.*

Participant[2]	*Definitive signature of the Protocol, Acceptance of the Protocol, Succession to the Convention and the Protocol, Ratification of the Convention and the Protocol*	*Ratification of the Convention as amended, Accession to the Convention as amended(a), Succession to the Convention as amended(d)*
Afghanistan	11 Dec 1946	
Albania	23 Jun 1947	
Algeria		31 Oct 1963 a
Argentina	11 Dec 1946	
Australia	28 Aug 1947	
Austria	17 May 1950	
Bahamas	13 Aug 1975	
Belgium	11 Dec 1946	
Benin		5 Dec 1961 d
Brazil	17 Dec 1946	
Burkina Faso		26 Apr 1963 a
Cambodia[2]		3 Oct 1951 d
Cameroon		20 Nov 1961 d
Canada	11 Dec 1946	
Central African Republic		4 Sep 1962 d
Chile	11 Dec 1946	
China[3]	11 Dec 1946	
Colombia	11 Dec 1946	
Congo		15 Oct 1962 d
Côte d'Ivoire		8 Dec 1961 d
Czech Republic[4]		30 Dec 1993 d
Democratic Republic of the Congo		31 May 1962 d
Denmark	15 Jun 1949	
Dominican Republic	11 Dec 1946	
Ecuador	8 Jun 1951	
Egypt	13 Sep 1948	
Ethiopia		9 Sep 1947
Fiji	1 Nov 1971	
Finland	3 Feb 1948	
France	10 Oct 1947	
Germany[5]	12 Aug 1959	
Ghana		7 Apr 1958 d
Greece	21 Feb 1949	
Guinea		26 Apr 1962 d
Haiti	31 May 1951	
Honduras	11 Dec 1946	
Hungary	16 Dec 1955	
India	11 Dec 1946	
Indonesia		3 Apr 1958 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	11 Dec 1946	
Iraq	14 Sep 1950	
Ireland	18 Feb 1948	
Israel		16 May 1952 a
Italy	25 Mar 1948	
Jamaica		26 Dec 1963 d
Japan	27 Mar 1952	
Jordan		12 Apr 1954 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic[2]		7 Oct 1950 d
Lebanon	13 Dec 1946	

Participant[2]	Definitive signature of the Protocol, Acceptance of the Protocol, Succession to the Convention and the Protocol, Ratification of the Convention and the Protocol	Ratification of the Convention as amended, Accession to the Convention as amended(a), Succession to the Convention as amended(d)
Lesotho		4 Nov 1974 d
Liechtenstein[6]	25 Sep 1947	
Malawi		22 Jul 1965 d
Malaysia		21 Aug 1958 d
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 d
Mexico	11 Dec 1946	
Monaco	21 Nov 1947	
Montenegro[7]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		7 Nov 1956 d
Netherlands	10 Mar 1948	
New Zealand[8]	11 Dec 1946	
Nicaragua	24 Apr 1950	
Niger		25 Aug 1961 d
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 d
Norway	2 Jul 1947	
Panama	15 Dec 1946	
Papua New Guinea	28 Oct 1980	
Philippines	25 May 1950	
Poland	11 Dec 1946	
Romania	11 Oct 1961	
Russian Federation	25 Oct 1947	
Rwanda		5 May 1964 d
Saudi Arabia	11 Dec 1946	
Senegal		2 May 1963 d
Serbia[9]		12 Mar 2001 d
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 d
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 d
South Africa	24 Feb 1948	
Spain	26 Sep 1955	
Sri Lanka		4 Dec 1957 a
Sweden	17 Oct 1947	
Switzerland[6]	25 Sep 1947	
Syrian Arab Republic	11 Dec 1946	
Thailand	27 Oct 1947	
Togo		27 Feb 1962 d
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 d
Turkey	11 Dec 1946	
Uganda		20 Oct 1965 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	11 Dec 1946	
United Republic of Tanzania		3 Jul 1964 a
United States of America	12 Aug 1947	
Zambia		9 Apr 1973 d

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
France	17 Mar 1950	Archipelago of the New Hebrides under French and British Condominium
United Kingdom	7 Mar 1949	Aden, Bahamas, Jamaica, Malta and St. Lucia
	5 Apr 1949	Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony
	17 Mar 1950	New Hebrides
	13 Feb 1952	Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate and Swaziland

Notes:

[1] The Agreement was amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946.

[2] The Republic of Viet-Nam had succeeded to the Convention on 11 August 1950.

By joint notifications received from the Governments of France and Viet-Nam on 11 August 1950; from the Governments of France and Laos, on 7 October 1950; and from the Governments of France and Cambodia on 3 October 1951, notice was given of the transfer of functions by the French Government to the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam, Laos and Cambodia of the duties and obligations arising from the application of the Convention in these countries. It should be noted that the Republic of Viet-Nam succeeded to the Convention on 11 August 1950. See also note 1 under "Viet Nam" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[4] Czechoslovakia, by virtue of its definitive signature on 11 December 1946 of the Protocol of 11 December 1946 amending the Convention of 1931, became a party to the Convention on the date of that signature. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The instrument of acceptance of the Protocol by the Government of the Swiss Confederation stipulates that the declaration of acceptance is also valid for the Principality of Liechtenstein.

[7] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] The former Yugoslavia had acceeded to the Convention as amended on 10 June 1949. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

8. a) Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs

Geneva, 13 July 1931

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 9 July 1933, in accordance with article 30.
REGISTRATION: 9 July 1933, No. 3219.[1]

Note: *In accordance with its article 44 (1), the provisions of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narocitc Drugs, 1961 of 8 August 1975, as between the parties thereto, terminates and replaces the provisions of the above Convention. See chapter VI.18.*

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Afghanistan

(June 21st, 1935 a)

Albania

(October 9th, 1937 a)

United States of America

(April 28th, 1932)

1. The Government of the United States of America reserves the right to impose, for purpose of internal control and control of import into, and export from, territory under its jurisdiction, of opium, coca leaves, all of their derivatives and similar substances produced by synthetic process, measures stricter than the provisions of the Convention.
2. The Government of the United States of America reserves the right to impose, for purposes of controlling transit through its territories of raw opium, coca leaves, all of their derivatives and similar substances produced by synthetic process, measures by which the production of an import permit issued by the country of destination may be made a condition precedent to the granting of permission for transit through its territory.
3. The Government of the United States of America finds it impracticable to undertake to send statistics of import and export to the Permanent Central Opium Board short of 60 days after the close of the three-month period to which such statistics refer.
4. The Government of the United States of America finds it impracticable to undertake to state separately amounts of drugs purchased or imported for Government purposes.
5. Plenipotentiaries of the United States of America formally declare that the signing of the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs by them on the part of the United States of America on this date is not to be construed to mean that the Government of the United States of America recognises a régime or entity which signs or accedes to the Convention as the Government of a country when that régime or entity is not recognised by the Government of the United States of America as the Government of that country.
6. The plenipotentiaries of the United States of America further declare that the participation of the United States of America in the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, signed on this date, does not involve any contractual obligation on the part of the United States of America to a country represented by a régime or entity which the Government of the United States of America does not recognise as the Government of that country until such country has a government recognised by the Government of the United States of America.

Saudi Arabia

(August 15th, 1936)

Argentina

(April 18th, 1946)

Austria

(July 3rd, 1934)

Belgium

(April 10th, 1933)

This ratification does not include the Belgian Congo, nor the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate.

Belgian Congo and Mandated Territory of Ruanda-Urundi

(December 17th, 1941 a)

Brazil

(April 5th, 1933)

Great Britain and Northern Ireland[2,3]

(April 1st, 1933)

His Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of any of his Colonies, Protectorates and Overseas Territories or territories under suzerainty or under mandate exercised by his Government in the United Kingdom.

British Honduras, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Ceylon, Cyprus, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Gambia (Colony and Protectorate), Gibraltar, Gold Coast [(a) Colony, (b) Ashanti, (c) Northern Territories, (d) Togoland under British Mandate], Hong-Kong, Kenya (Colony and Protectorate), Leeward Islands (Antigua, Dominica, Montserrat, St. Christopher and Nevis, Virgin Islands), Mauritius, Nigeria [(a) Colony, (b) Protectorate, (c) Cameroons under British Mandate], North Borneo (State of), Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland Protectorate, Sarawak, Seychelles, Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate), Somaliland Protectorate, Straits Settlements, Tanganyika Territory, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda Protectorate, Zanzibar Protectorate

(May 18th, 1936 a)

Southern Rhodesia

(July 14th, 1937 a)

Barbados, Bermuda, British Guiana, Fiji, Malay States [(a) Federated Malay States: Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Selangor; (b) Unfederated Malay States: Kedah, Perlis and Brunei], Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan), St. Helena and Ascension, Trans-Jordan, Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Vincent), Burma

(August 24th, 1938 a)

Newfoundland

(June 28th, 1937 a)

Canada

(October 17th, 1932)

Australia

(January 24th, 1934 a)

This accession applies to *Papua, Norfolk Island* and the mandated territories of *New Guinea* and *Nauru* .

New Zealand

(June 17th, 1935 a)

Union of South Africa

(January 4th, 1938 a)

Ireland

(April 11th, 1933 a)

India

(November 14th, 1932)

Bulgaria

(March 20th, 1933 a)

Chile

(March 31st, 1933)

China[3,4,5]

(January 10th, 1934 a)

Colombia

(January 29th, 1934 a)

Costa Rica

(April 5th, 1933)

Cuba

(April 4th, 1933)

Czechoslovakia[6]

(April 12th, 1933)

Denmark

(June 5th, 1936)

Dominican Republic

(April 8th, 1933)

Ecuador

(April 13th, 1935 a)

Egypt

(April 10th, 1933)

Estonia

(July 5th, 1935 a)

Finland

(September 25th, 1936 a)

France

(April 10th, 1933)

The French Government makes every reservation, with regard to the Colonies, Protectorates and mandated Territories under its authority, as to the possibility of regularly producing the quarterly statistics referred to in Article 13 within the strict time-limit laid down.

Germany

(April 10th, 1933)

Greece

(December 27th, 1934)

Guatemala

(May 1st, 1933)

Haiti

(May 4th, 1933 a)

Honduras

(September 21st, 1934 a)

Hungary

(April 10th, 1933 a)

Iran

(September 28th, 1932)

Iraq

(May 30th, 1934 a)

Italy

(March 21st, 1933)

Japan[7]

(June 3rd, 1935)

The Japanese Government declare that, in view of the necessity of close co-operation between the High Contracting Parties in order to carry out most effectively the provisions of the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, signed at Geneva on July 13th, 1931, they understand that the present position of Japan, regardless of whether she be a Member of the League of Nations or not, is to be maintained in the matter of the composition of the organs and the appointment of the members thereof mentioned in the said Convention.

Latvia

(August 3rd, 1937 a)

Liechtenstein[8]

Lithuania

(April 10th, 1933)

Luxembourg

(May 30th, 1936)

Mexico

(March 13th, 1933)

The Government of the United States of Mexico reserves the right to impose in its territory--as it had already done--measures more severe than those laid down by the Conven tion itself, for the restriction of the cultivation or the prepara tion, use, possession, importation, exportation and consumption of the drugs to which the present Convention refers.

Monaco

(February 16th, 1933)

The Netherlands

(including the *Netherlands Indies* , *Surinam* and *Curaçao*)

(May 22nd, 1933)

Nicaragua

(March 16th, 1932 a)

Norway

(September 12th, 1934 a)

Panama

(April 15th, 1935)

Paraguay

(June 25th, 1941)

Peru

(May 20th, 1932 a)

Poland

(April 11th, 1933)

Portugal[5]

(June 17th, 1932)

The Portuguese Government makes every reservation with regard to its colonies as to the possibility of regularly producing the quarterly statistics referred to in article 13 within the strict time-limit laid down.

Romania

(April 11th, 1933)

Salvador

(April 7th, 1933 a)

(a) The Republic of Salvador does not agree to the provisions of Article 26, on the ground that there is no reason why the High Contracting Parties should be given the option of not applying the Convention to their colonies, protectorates, and overseas mandated territories.

(b) The Republic of Salvador states that it disagrees with the reservations embodied in Nos. 5 and 6 of the Declarations made by the plenipotentiaries of the United States of America regarding Governments not recognised by the Government of that country; in its opinion, those reservations constitute an infringement of the national sovereignty of Salvador, whose present Government, though not as yet recognised by the United States Government, has been recognised by the majority of the civilised countries of the world. Their recognition is due to their conviction that that Government is a perfectly constitutional one and affords a full and complete guarantee of the performance of its international duties, inasmuch as it enjoys the unanimous, decided and effective support of all the inhabitants of the Republic, whether citizens of the country or foreigners resident therein.

As it respects the internal régimes of other nations, the Republic of Salvador considers that the Convention in question, being of a strictly hygienic and humanitarian character, does not offer a suitable occasion to formulate such political reservations as have called forth this comment.

San Marino

(June 12th, 1933)

Spain

(April 7th, 1933)

Sudan

(August 25th, 1932 a)

Sweden

(August 12th, 1932)

Switzerland[8]

(April 10th, 1933)

Thailand

(February 22nd, 1934)

As its harmful-habit-forming drugs law goes beyond the provisions of the Geneva Convention and the present Convention on certain points, the Thai Government reserves the right to apply its existing law.

Turkey

(April 3rd, 1933 a)

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

(October 31st, 1935 a)

Uruguay

(April 7th, 1933)

Venezuela

(November 15th, 1933)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Bolivia

Liberia

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[9]	***Ratification, Succession(d)***
Bahamas	13 Aug 1975
Czech Republic[6]	30 Dec 1993 d
Fiji	1 Nov 1971 d
Papua New Guinea	28 Oct 1980 d
Slovakia[6]	28 May 1993 d
Zimbabwe	1 Dec 1998 d

Notes:

[1] See League of Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 139, p. 301.

[2] On 3 October 1983, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following objection:

[The Government of Argentina makes a] formal objection to the [declaration] of territorial extension made by the United Kingdom with regard to the Malvinas Islands and (dependencies), which that country is illegally occupying and refers to as the "Falkland Islands".

The Argentine Republic rejects and considers null and void the [said declaration] of territorial extension.

With reference to the above-mentioned objection the Secretary-General received, on 28 February 1985, from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following declaration:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to their right, by notification to the Depositary under the relevant provisions of the above-mentioned Convention, to extend the application of the Convention in question to the Falkland Islands or to the Falkland Islands Dependencies, as the case may be.

For this reason alone, the Government of the United Kingdom are unable to regard the Argentine [communication] under reference as having any legal effect."

[3] See note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and

Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[5] See note 1 under "Portugal" regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] Before ratifying the Convention with the declaration here set out, the Japanese Government consulted the Contracting Parties, through the intermediary of the Secretary-General. A summary of the correspondence which took place was published in the League of Nations *Official Journal* for September 1935 (16th Year, No. 9).

[8] The Swiss Federal Political Department, by a letter dated July 15th, 1936, informed the Secretariat of the following:

"Under the terms of the arrangements concluded between the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Swiss Government in 1929 and 1935, in application of the Customs Union Treaty concluded between these two countries on March 29th, 1923, the Swiss legislation on narcotic drugs, including all the measures taken by the Federal authorities to give effect to the different international Conventions on dangerous drugs, will be applicable to the territory of the Principality in the same way as to the territory of the Confederation, as long as the said Treaty remains in force. The Principality of Liechtenstein will accordingly participate, so long as the said Treaty remains in force, in the international Conventions which have been or may hereafter be concluded in the matter of narcotic drugs, it being neither necessary nor advisable for that country to accede to them separately."

[9] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Conventions as from 7 April 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received on 16 March 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974 concerning the application, as from 7 April 1958, of the Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs of 13 July 1931, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic this declaration has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the re application of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, July 13th, 1931 to which it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

8. b) Protocol of Signature

Geneva, 13 July 1931

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 9 July 1933.
REGISTRATION: 9 July 1933, No. 3219.[1]

Note: *In accordance with its article 44 (1), the provisions of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narocitc Drugs, 1961 of 8 August 1975, as between the parties thereto, terminates and replaces the provisions of the above Protocol. See chapter VI.18.*

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Albania	(October 9th, 1937 a)
Austria	(July 3rd, 1934)
United States of America	(April 28th, 1932)
Saudi Arabia	(August 15th, 1936)
Belgium	(April 10th, 1933)
Brazil	(April 5th, 1933)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland[2]	(April 1st, 1933)
Same reservation as for the Convention.	
British Honduras, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Ceylon, Cyprus, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Gambia (Colony and Protectorate), Gibraltar, Gold Coast [(a) Colony, (b) Ashanti, (c) Northern Territories, (d) Togoland under British Mandate], Hong-Kong, Kenya (Colony and Protectorate), Leeward Islands (Antigua, Dominica, Montserrat, St. Christopher and Nevis, Virgin Islands), Mauritius, Nigeria [(a) Colony, (b) Protectorate, (c) Cameroons under British Mandate], North Borneo (State of), Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland Protectorate, Sarawak, Seychelles, Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate), Somaliland Protectorate, Straits Settlements, Tanganyika Territory, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda Protectorate, Zanzibar Protectorate	(May 18th, 1936 a)
Southern Rhodesia	(July 14th, 1937 a)
Barbados, Bermuda, British Guiana, Fiji, Malay States [(a) Federated Malay States: Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Selangor; (b) Unfederated Malay States: Kedah, Perlis and Brunei], Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan), St. Helena and Ascension, Trans-Jordan, Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Vincent), Burma	(August 24th, 1938 a)
Newfoundland	(June 28th, 1937 a)
Canada	(October 17th, 1932)
Australia	(January 24th, 1934 a)
New Zealand	(June 17th, 1935 a)
Union of South Africa	(January 4th, 1938 a)
Ireland	(April 11th, 1933 a)
India	(November 14th, 1932)
Chile	(November 20th, 1933)
Colombia	(January 29th, 1934 a)
Costa Rica	(April 5th, 1933)
Cuba	(April 4th, 1933)
Czechoslovakia[3]	(April 12th, 1933 a)
Denmark	(June 5th, 1936)
Dominican Republic	(April 8th, 1933)
Ecuador	(April 13th, 1935 a)
Egypt	(April 10th, 1933)
Estonia	(July 5th, 1935 a)
Finland	(September 25th, 1936 a)
France	(April 10th, 1933)
Germany	(April 10th, 1933)
Greece	(December 27th, 1934)
Honduras	(September 21st, 1934 a)
Hungary	(April 10th, 1933 a)
Iran	(September 28th, 1932)
Italy	(March 21st, 1933)
Japan	

(June 3rd, 1935)

Liechtenstein[4]

Lithuania

(April 10th, 1933)

Luxembourg

(May 30th, 1936)

Mexico

(March 13th, 1933)

Monaco

(March 20th, 1933)

The Netherlands[5]

(May 22nd, 1933)

(including the *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curaçao*)

Nicaragua

(March 16th, 1932 a)

Norway

(September 12th, 1934 a)

Peru

(May 20th, 1932 a)

Poland

(April 11th, 1933)

Portugal[6]

(June 17th, 1932)

Romania

(April 11th, 1933)

San Marino

(June 12th, 1933)

Spain

(April 7th, 1933)

Sudan

(January 18th, 1933 a)

Sweden

(August 12th, 1932)

Switzerland[4]

(April 10th, 1933)

Thailand

(February 22nd, 1934)

Turkey

(April 3rd, 1933 a)

Uruguay

(April 7th, 1933)

Venezuela

(September 11th, 1934)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Bolivia
Guatemala
Panama
Paraguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[7]	***Ratification, Succession(d)***
Bahamas	13 Aug 1975
Czech Republic[3]	30 Dec 1993 d
Fiji	1 Nov 1971 d
Papua New Guinea	28 Oct 1980 d
Slovakia[3]	28 May 1993 d

Notes:

[1] See League of Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 139, p. 301.

[2] See note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] The Swiss Federal Political Department, by a letter dated July 15th, 1936, informed the Secretariat of the following:

"Under the terms of the arrangements concluded between the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Swiss Government in 1929 and 1935, in application of the Customs Union Treaty concluded between these two countries on March 29th, 1923, the Swiss legislation on narcotic drugs, including all the measures taken by the Federal authorities to give effect to the different international Conventions on dangerous drugs, will be applicable to the territory of the Principality in the same way as to the territory of the Confederation, as long as the said Treaty remains in force. The Principality of Liechtenstein will accordingly participate, so long as the said Treaty remains in force, in the international Conventions which have been or may hereafter be concluded in the matter of narcotic drugs, it being neither necessary nor advisable for that country to4accede to them separately."

[5] The instrument of ratification specifies that the reservation relating to paragraph 2 of article 22, as formulated by the Representative of the Netherlands at the time of signature of the Protocol, should be considered as withdrawn.

[6] See note 1 under “Portugal” regarding Macao in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Conventions as from 7 April 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received on 16 March 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974 concerning the application, as from 7 April 1958, of the Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs of 13 July 1931, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic this declaration has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the re application of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, July 13th, 1931 to which it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

9. AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE SUPPRESSION OF OPIUM SMOKING

Bangkok, 27 November 1931 and Lake Success, New York, 11 December 1946[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 27 October 1947, the date on which the amendments to the Agreement, as set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 11 December 1946, entered into force, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article VII of the Protocol.

Note: *In accordance with its article 44 (1), the provisions of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narocitc Drugs, 1961 of 8 August 1975, as between the parties thereto, terminates and replaces the provisions of the above Agreement. See chapter VI.18.*

Participant[2]	*Definitive signature of the Protocol, Acceptance of the Protocol, Notification in respect of the Agreement as amended(d)*
Cambodia[2]	3 Oct 1951 d
France	10 Oct 1947
India	11 Dec 1946
Japan	27 Mar 1952
Lao People's Democratic Republic[2]	7 Oct 1950 d
Netherlands	10 Mar 1948
Thailand	27 Oct 1947
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	11 Dec 1946

Notes:

[1] The Agreement was amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946.

[2] The Republic of Viet-Nam had succeeded to the Agreement on 11 August 1950.

By joint notifications received from the Governments of France and Viet-Nam on 11 August 1950; from the Governments of France and Laos, on 7 October 1950; and from the Governments of France and Cambodia on 3 October 1951, notice was given of the transfer of functions by the French Government to the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam, Laos and Cambodia of the duties and obligations arising from the application of the Convention in these countries. It should be noted that the Republic of Viet-Nam succeeded to the Convention on 11 August 1950. See also note 1 under "Viet Nam" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

10. AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE SUPPRESSION OF OPIUM SMOKING

Bangkok, 27 November 1931

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 22 April 1937, in accordance with article VI.
REGISTRATION: 22 April 1937, No. 4100.[1]

Note: *In accordance with its article 44 (1), the provisions of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narocitc Drugs, 1961 of 8 August 1975, as between the parties thereto, terminates and replaces the provisions of the above Agreement. See chapter VI.18.*

Ratifications

Participant	*Ratification*
France	(May, 10th, 1933)
India	(Dec 4th, 1935)
Japan	(Jan 22nd, 1937)
Netherlands	(May 22nd, 1933)
Portugal	(Jan 27th, 1934)
Thailand With reservation to Article I.	(Nov 19th, 1934)
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	(Apr 3rd, 1933)

Notes:

[1] See League of Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 177, p. 373.

11. CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN DANGEROUS DRUGS

Geneva, 26 June 1936 and Lake Success, New York, 11 December 1946[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 October 1947, the date on which the amendments to the Convention, as set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 11 December 1946, entered into force, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article VII of the Protocol.

Participant	*Definitive signature of the Protocol, Acceptance of the Protocol*	*Ratification of the Convention as amended, Accession to the Convention as amended(a)*
Austria		17 May 1950
Belgium	11 Dec 1946	
Brazil	17 Dec 1946	
Cambodia		3 Oct 1951 a
Cameroon		15 Jan 1962 a
Canada	11 Dec 1946	
Chile		21 Nov 1972 a
China[2]	11 Dec 1946	
Colombia	11 Dec 1946	
Côte d'Ivoire		20 Dec 1961 a
Cuba		9 Aug 1967
Dominican Republic		9 Jun 1958 a
Egypt	13 Sep 1948	
Ethiopia		9 Sep 1947 a
France	10 Oct 1947	
Greece	21 Feb 1949	
Haiti	31 May 1951	
India	11 Dec 1946	
Indonesia		3 Apr 1958 a
Israel		16 May 1952 a

Participant	*Definitive signature of the Protocol, Acceptance of the Protocol*	*Ratification of the Convention as amended, Accession to the Convention as amended(a)*
Italy		3 Apr 1961 a
Japan		7 Sep 1955
Jordan		7 May 1958 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		13 Jul 1951 a
Liechtenstein		24 May 1961 a
Luxembourg		28 Jun 1955 a
Madagascar		11 Dec 1974 a
Malawi		8 Jun 1965 a
Mexico		6 May 1955
Netherlands[3,4]		[19 Mar 1959]
Romania	11 Oct 1961	
Rwanda		15 Jul 1981 a
Spain[5]		5 Jun 1970
Sri Lanka		4 Dec 1957 a
Switzerland		31 Dec 1952
Turkey	11 Dec 1946	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification or accession.)

CUBA

The Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba expressly reserves its position on the provisions of article 17 of the Convention, being ready to settle any dispute which may arise on the interpretation or application of the Convention bilaterally, by means of diplomatic consultations.

ITALY

. . . In exercise of the right accorded to it by article 13, paragraph 2, of the said Convention, the Government of Italy desires that, in the case of letters of request concerning narcotic drugs, the procedure hitherto followed in previous relations with the other Contracting States should continue to be used and, failing that, the diplomatic channel, provided, however, that the method specified in article 13, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (c) should be adopted in cases of emergency.

MEXICO

In accepting the provisions of articles 11 and 12 of this Convention, the Government of the United States of Mexico wishes to state explicitly that its Central Office will exercise the powers granted to it by the said Convention unless such powers have been expressly conferred by the General Constitution of the Republic on an agency of a constituent State, being an agency established before the date of the entry into force of this Convention, and that the Government of the United States of Mexico reserves the right to impose in its territory–as it has already done–measures more severe than those laid down by the Convention itself, for the restriction of the cultivation or the manufacture, extraction, possession, offering for sale, importation or exportation of or traffic in the drugs to which the present Convention refers.

Notes:

[1] The Agreement was amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946.

[2] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[3] The instrument of ratification stipulates that the Convention and the Protocol of signature will be applicable to the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and the Netherlands New Guinea. In a communication received on 4 August 1960, the Government of the Netherlands notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will be applicable to the Netherlands Antilles. The ratification was made subject to the reservation recorded in the Protocol of Signature annexed to the Convention; for the text of that reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 327, p. 322.

[4] In a communication received on 14 December 1965, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands notified the Secretary-General of the denunciation of the Convention for the territory of the Kingdom in Europe and the Territories of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. The denunciation took effect on 14 December 1966.

[5] Instrument of ratification of the unamended 1936 Convention. Spain, on behalf of which the Protocol of 11 December 1946 amending the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on narcotic drugs concluded at The Hague on 23 January 1912, at Geneva on 11 February 1925, 19 February 1925 and 13 July 1931, at Bangkok on 27 November 1931 and at Geneva on 26 June 1936 was signed definitively on 26 September 1955 (see chapter VI.1), has, as a result of the said definitive signature and of its ratification of the unamended 1936 Convention, become a party to the said Convention of 1936 as amended by the said Protocol of 1946.

12. a) Convention of 1936 for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs

Geneva, 26 June 1936

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 26 October 1939, in accordance with article 22.
REGISTRATION: 26 October 1939, No. 4648.[1]

Note: In accordance with its article 44 (1), the provisions of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961 of 8 August 1975 (1975 Convention), as between the parties thereto which are also parties the above Convention, terminate article 9 of the above Convention and replace it with paragraph 2 (b) of article 36 of the 1975 Convention; provided that such a party may by notification to the Secretary-General continue in force the said article 9.

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Belgium	(Nov 27th, 1937) Belgium does not assume any obligation as regards the Belgian Congo and the Territories of Ruanda-Urundi in respect of which a mandate is being exercised by her on behalf of the League of Nations.
Brazil	(Jul 2nd, 1938)
Canada	(Sep 27th, 1938)
China[2]	(Oct 21st, 1937)
Colombia	(Apr 11th, 1944)
Egypt	(Jan 29th, 1940)
France	(Jan 16th, 1940) The French Government does not assume any obligations as regards its Colonies or Protectorates or the territories placed under its mandate.
Greece	(Feb 16th, 1938)
Guatemala	(Aug 2nd, 1938 a)
Haiti	(Nov 30th, 1938 a)
India	(Aug 4th, 1937)
Romania	(Jun 28th, 1938)
Turkey	(Jul 28th, 1939 a)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

- Great Britain
- Bulgaria
- Cuba
- Czechoslovakia[3]
- Denmark
- Ecuador
- Estonia
- Honduras
- Hungary
- Monaco
- Panama
- Poland
- Portugal
- Spain
- Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
- Uruguay
- Venezuela

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[4]	*Ratification, Succession(d)*	*Participant*[4]	*Ratification, Succession(d)*
Czech Republic[3]	30 Dec 1993 d	Spain[5]	5 Jun 1970

Notes:

[1] See League of Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol.198, p.299.

[2] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[3] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] A notification of denunciation by the Government of Pakistan was received by the Secretary-General on 9 July 1965. It should be noted, however, that the Government of Pakistan, not having previously notified its succession to the Convention, was not, under the international practice to which the Secretary-General adheres to as the depositary of multilateral treaties, considered at that time as a party to the Convention.

[5] Instrument of ratification of the unamended 1936 Convention. Spain, on behalf of which the Protocol of 11 December 1946 amending the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on narcotic drugs concluded at The Hague on 23 January 1912, at Geneva on 11 February 1925, 19 February 1925 and 13 July 1931, at Bangkok on 27 November 1931 and at Geneva on 26 June 1936 was signed definitively on 26 September 1955 (see chapter VI.1), has, as a result of the said definitive signature and of its ratification of the unamended 1936 Convention, become a party to the said Convention of 1936 as amended by the said Protocol of 1946.

12. b) Protocol of Signature

Geneva, 26 June 1936

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 26 October 1939.
REGISTRATION: 26 October 1939, No. 4648.[1]

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Belgium	(Nov 27th, 1937)
Brazil	(Jul 2nd, 1938)
Canada	(Sep 27th, 1938)
China[2]	(Oct 21st, 1937)
Colombia	(Apr 11th, 1944)
Egypt	(Jan 29th, 1940)
France	(Jan 16th, 1940) Same reservation as for the Convention.
Greece	(Feb 16th, 1938)
Guatemala	(Aug 2nd, 1938 a)
Haiti	(Nov 30th, 1938 a)
India	(Aug 4th, 1937)
Romania	(Jun 28th, 1938)
Turkey	(Jul 28th, 1939 a)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Bulgaria
Cuba
Czechoslovakia[3]
Denmark
Ecuador
Estonia
Honduras
Hungary
Monaco
Panama
Poland
Portugal
Spain
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[4]	*Ratification, Succession(d)*	*Participant*[4]	*Ratification, Succession(d)*
Czech Republic[3]	30 Dec 1993 d	Spain[5]	5 Jun 1970

Notes:

[1] See League of Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol.198, p.299.

[2] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[3] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] A notification of denunciation by the Government of Pakistan was received by the Secretary-General on 9 July 1965. It should be noted, however, that the Government of Pakistan, not having previously notified its succession to the Convention,

was not, under the international practice to which the Secretary-General adheres to as the depositary of multilateral treaties, considered at that time as a party to the Convention.

[5] Instrument of ratification of the unamended 1936 Convention. Spain, on behalf of which the Protocol of 11 December 1946 amending the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on narcotic drugs concluded at The Hague on 23 January 1912, at Geneva on 11 February 1925, 19 February 1925 and 13 July 1931, at Bangkok on 27 November 1931 and at Geneva on 26 June 1936 was signed definitively on 26 September 1955 (see chapter VI.1), has, as a result of the said definitive signature and of its ratification of the unamended 1936 Convention, become a party to the said Convention of 1936 as amended by the said Protocol of 1946.

13. Protocol Bringing under International Control Drugs Outside the Scope of the Convention of 13 July 1931 for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, as amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946

Paris, 19 November 1948

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	1 December 1949, in accordance with article 6.
REGISTRATION:	1 December 1949, No. 688.
STATUS:	Signatories: 39. Parties: 90.
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 44, p. 277.

Note: The Protocol was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 211 (III)[1] of 8 October 1948.

In accordance with its article 44 (1), the provisions of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narocitc Drugs, 1961 of 8 August 1975, as between the parties thereto, terminates and replaces the provisions of the above Protocol. See chapter VI.18.

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Definitive signature(s), Acceptance(A), Succession(d)*
Afghanistan		19 Nov 1948 s
Albania	19 Nov 1948	25 Jul 1949 A
Argentina	19 Nov 1948	
Australia		19 Nov 1948 s
Austria		17 May 1950 A
Bahamas		13 Aug 1975 d
Belarus		19 Nov 1948 s
Belgium	19 Nov 1948	21 Nov 1951 A
Benin		5 Dec 1961 d
Bolivia	19 Nov 1948	
Brazil	19 Nov 1948	9 Dec 1959 A
Burkina Faso		26 Apr 1963 A
Cameroon		20 Nov 1961 d
Canada		19 Nov 1948 s
Central African Republic		4 Sep 1962 d
Chile	19 Nov 1948	
China[3,4]		19 Nov 1948 s
Colombia	19 Nov 1948	
Congo		15 Oct 1962 d
Costa Rica	19 Nov 1948	
Côte d'Ivoire		8 Dec 1961 d
Cuba		30 Jun 1961 A
Czech Republic[5]		30 Dec 1993 d
Democratic Republic of the Congo		13 Aug 1962 d
Denmark	19 Nov 1948	19 Oct 1949 A
Dominican Republic	19 Nov 1948	9 Jun 1958 A
Ecuador	19 Nov 1948	30 Aug 1962 A
Egypt	6 Dec 1948	16 Sep 1949 A
El Salvador	19 Nov 1948	31 Dec 1959 A
Ethiopia		5 May 1949 s
Fiji		1 Nov 1971 d
Finland		31 Oct 1949 A
France	19 Nov 1948	11 Jan 1949 A
Germany[6,7]		12 Aug 1959 A
Ghana		7 Apr 1958 d
Greece	7 Dec 1948	29 Jul 1952 A
Guatemala	19 Nov 1948	
Honduras	19 Nov 1948	
Hungary		2 Jul 1957 A
India	19 Nov 1948	10 Nov 1950 A
Indonesia		21 Feb 1951 A
Iraq	12 Jul 1949	27 Jul 1954 A
Ireland		11 Aug 1952 A
Israel		16 May 1952 A
Italy		14 Mar 1949 s
Jamaica		26 Dec 1963 d
Japan		5 May 1952 A
Jordan		7 May 1958 A
Lao People's Democratic Republic[2]		7 Oct 1950 d
Lebanon		19 Nov 1948 s
Lesotho		4 Nov 1974 d
Liberia	19 Nov 1948	

Participant[2]	Signature	Definitive signature(s), Acceptance(A), Succession(d)
Liechtenstein	19 Nov 1948	24 May 1961 A
Luxembourg	19 Nov 1948	17 Oct 1952 A
Malawi		22 Jul 1965 d
Malaysia		21 Aug 1958 d
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 d
Mexico		19 Nov 1948 s
Monaco		19 Nov 1948 s
Montenegro[8]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		7 Nov 1956 d
Myanmar	19 Nov 1948	2 Mar 1950 A
Netherlands	19 Nov 1948	26 Sep 1950 A
New Zealand[9]		19 Nov 1948 s
Nicaragua	19 Nov 1948	13 Jan 1961 A
Niger		25 Aug 1961 d
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 d
Norway	19 Nov 1948	24 May 1949 A
Pakistan	21 Nov 1948	27 Aug 1952 A
Panama	19 Nov 1948	
Papua New Guinea		28 Oct 1980 d
Paraguay	19 Nov 1948	15 Aug 2001 A
Peru	19 Nov 1948	
Philippines	10 Mar 1949	7 Dec 1953 A
Poland		26 Jan 1949 s
Romania	19 Nov 1948	11 Oct 1961 A
Russian Federation		7 May 1959 A
Rwanda		30 Apr 1964 d
San Marino	19 Nov 1948	
Saudi Arabia		19 Nov 1948 s
Senegal		2 May 1963 d
Serbia[10]		12 Mar 2001 d
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 d
Slovakia[5]		28 May 1993 d
South Africa		8 Dec 1948 s
Spain		26 Sep 1955 s
Sri Lanka		17 Jan 1949 A
Sweden		3 Mar 1949 s
Switzerland	19 Nov 1948	18 Mar 1953 A
Togo		27 Feb 1962 d
Tonga		5 Sep 1973 d
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 d
Turkey	19 Nov 1948	14 Jul 1950 A
Uganda		15 Apr 1965 A
Ukraine	19 Nov 1948	7 May 1959 A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[4]		19 Nov 1948 s
United Republic of Tanzania		7 Oct 1964 A
United States of America	19 Nov 1948	
Uruguay	22 Nov 1948	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	19 Nov 1948	
Yemen[11]		12 Dec 1949 s
Zambia		9 Apr 1973 d
Zimbabwe		1 Dec 1998 d

Territorial Application

Participant	Date of receipt of the notification	Territories
Australia	19 Nov 1948	All territories including the Trust Territories of New Guinea and Nauru
Belgium	27 Jan 1953	Belgian Congo and Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi
Denmark	19 Oct 1949	Greenland
Germany	22 Jan 1960	Land Berlin
France	15 Sep 1949	New Hebrides Archipelago under Anglo-French Condominium
	15 Sep 1949	Departments of Algeria, Overseas Departments (Guadeloupe, Guiana, Martinique, Réunion), Overseas Territories (French West Africa, French Equatorial Africa, French

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
		Somaliland, Madagascar and Dependencies, Comoro Islands, French Establishments in India, New Caledonia and Dependencies, French Establishments in Oceania, Saint-Pierre and Miquelon); Tunisia and Morocco (French zone of the Sherifian Empire); Trust Territories of Togoland and the Cameroons under French Administration
	25 Nov 1949	Viet Nam
	28 Dec 1949	Laos
Italy	12 Mar 1954	Somaliland under Italian Administration
Netherlands	14 Aug 1952	Netherlands Antilles, Netherlands New Guinea and Suriname
New Zealand	19 Nov 1948	All the territories, including the Trust Territory of Western Samoa
South Africa	5 Oct 1954	Southwest Africa (Namibia)
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	19 Nov 1948	Aden, Bahamas, Barbados, Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, Brunei, Cyprus, Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and Dependencies, Federation of Malaya, Fiji, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Gold Coast Colony, Hong Kong, Jamaica, Kenya, Leeward Islands, Malta, Mauritius, Newfoundland, Nigeria, North Borneo, Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, St. Helena, Sarawak, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalian Protectorate, Southern Rhodesia, Tanganyika, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda Protectorate, Windward Islands and Zanzibar Protectorate
	27 Feb 1950	New Hebrides Archipelago under Anglo-French Condominium
United States of America	11 Aug 1950	United States Territories

---

Notes:

[1] Resolution 211 (III). *Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Part I, Resolutions (A/810)* , p. 62.

[2] The Republic of Viet-Nam had succeeded to the Protocol on 11 August 1950.

By joint notifications received from the Governments of France and Viet-Nam on 11 August 1950; from the Governments of France and Laos, on 7 October 1950; and from the Governments of France and Cambodia on 3 October 1951, notice was given of the transfer of functions by the French Government to the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam, Laos and Cambodia of the duties and obligations arising from the application of the Convention in these countries. It should be noted that the Republic of Viet-Nam succeeded to the Convention on 11 August 1950. See also note 1 under "Viet Nam" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note concerning signature, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[4] See note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Protocol on 19 November 1948 and 17 January 1950, respectively. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the

"Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] The former Yugoslavia had signed and accepted the Protocol on 19 November 1948 and 10 June 1949, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[11] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

14. Protocol for Limiting and Regulating the Cultivation of the Poppy Plant, the Production of, International and Wholesale Trade in, and use of Opium

New York, 23 June 1953

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 8 March 1963, in accordance with article 21.
REGISTRATION: 8 March 1963, No. 6555.
STATUS: Signatories: 34. Parties: 51.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 456, p. 3.

Note: The Protocol was adopted and opened for signature by the United Nations Opium Conference, held at United Nations Headquarters, New York, from 11 May to 18 June 1953. The Conference was convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations pursuant to resolution 436 A (XIV)[1] of 27 May 1952 of the United Nations Economic and Social Council. The Conference also adopted the Final Act and seventeen resolutions, for the text of which see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 456, p. 3.

In accordance with its article 44 (1), the provisions of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narocitc Drugs, 1961 of 8 August 1975, as between the parties thereto, terminates and replaces the provisions of the above Protocol. See chapter VI.18.

Participant[2]	*Signature, Succession to signature(d)*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Argentina		24 Mar 1958 a
Australia		13 Jan 1955 a
Belgium		30 Jun 1958 a
Brazil		3 Nov 1959 a
Cambodia	29 Dec 1953	22 Mar 1957
Cameroon		15 Jan 1962 d
Canada	23 Dec 1953	7 May 1954
Central African Republic		4 Sep 1962 d
Chile	9 Jul 1953	9 May 1957
China[3]		25 May 1954
Congo		15 Oct 1962 d
Costa Rica	16 Oct 1953	
Côte d'Ivoire		8 Dec 1961 d
Cuba		8 Sep 1954 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo		31 May 1962 d
Denmark	23 Jun 1953	20 Jul 1954
Dominican Republic	23 Jun 1953	9 Jun 1958
Ecuador	23 Jun 1953	17 Aug 1955
Egypt	23 Jun 1953	8 Mar 1954
El Salvador		31 Dec 1959 a
France	23 Jun 1953	21 Apr 1954
Germany[4,5]	23 Jun 1953	12 Aug 1959
Greece	23 Jun 1953	6 Feb 1963
Guatemala		29 May 1956 a
India	23 Jun 1953	30 Apr 1954
Indonesia		11 Jul 1957 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	15 Dec 1953	30 Dec 1959
Iraq	29 Dec 1953	
Israel	30 Dec 1953	8 Oct 1957
Italy	23 Jun 1953	13 Nov 1957
Japan	23 Jun 1953	21 Jul 1954
Jordan		7 May 1958 a
Lebanon	11 Nov 1953	
Liechtenstein	23 Jun 1953	24 May 1961
Luxembourg		28 Jun 1955 a
Madagascar		31 Jul 1963 d
Monaco	26 Jun 1953	12 Apr 1956
Montenegro[6]	23 Oct 2006 d	
Netherlands	30 Dec 1953	
New Zealand[7]	[28 Dec 1953]	[2 Nov 1956]
Nicaragua		11 Dec 1959 a
Niger		7 Dec 1964 d
Pakistan	3 Dec 1953	10 Mar 1955
Panama	28 Dec 1953	13 Apr 1954
Papua New Guinea		28 Oct 1980 d
Paraguay		15 Aug 2001 a
Philippines	23 Jun 1953	1 Jun 1955
Republic of Korea	23 Jun 1953	29 Apr 1958
Rwanda		30 Apr 1964 d
Senegal		2 May 1963 d
Serbia[8]	12 Mar 2001 d	
South Africa	29 Dec 1953	9 Mar 1960
Spain	22 Oct 1953	15 Jun 1956

Participant[2]	*Signature, Succession to signature(d)*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Sri Lanka		4 Dec 1957 a
Sweden		16 Jan 1958 a
Switzerland	23 Jun 1953	27 Nov 1956
Turkey	28 Dec 1953	15 Jul 1963
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	23 Jun 1953	
United States of America	23 Jun 1953	18 Feb 1955
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	30 Dec 1953	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

CAMBODIA

The Royal Government of Cambodia expresses its intention of availing itself of the provisions of article 19 of the Protocol.

FRANCE

It is expressly declared that the French Government reserves the right, in respect of French establishments in India, to apply the transitional measures of article 19 of this Protocol, it being understood that the period mentioned in paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (b) (iii) of that article shall be fifteen years after the coming into effect of this Protocol.

The French Government likewise reserves the right in accordance with the transitional measures of article 19 to authorize the export of opium to French establishments in India for the same period of time.

INDIA

"1. It is hereby expressly declared that the Government of India, in accordance with the provisions of article 19 of this Protocol, will permit

"(i) The use of opium for quasi-medical purposes until 31 December 1959;

"(ii) The production of opium and the export thereof, for quasi-medical purposes, to Pakistan, Ceylon, Aden and the French and Portuguese possessions on the subcontinent of India for a period of fifteen years from the date of the coming into force of this Protocol; and

"(iii) The smoking of opium, for their lifetime, by addicts not under 21 years of age, registered by the appropriate authorities for that purpose on or before 30 September 1953.

"2. The Government of India expressly reserve to them selves the right to modify this declaration or to make any other declaration under article 19 of this Protocol, at the time of the deposit by them of their instrument of ratification."

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

"The Imperial Government of Iran, in accordance with article 25 of the Protocol for Limiting and Regulating the Cultivation of the Poppy Plant, the Production of, International and Wholesale Trade in, and Use of Opium, done at New York on 23 June 1953, and in accordance with article 16 of the Bill approved by the Iranian Parliament on 16 Bahman 1337 (7 February 1959), declares its ratification of the Protocol, and hereby further specifies that its ratification of the Protocol will in no way affect the status of the Law providing for the Prohibition of the Poppy Cultivation, as approved by Parliament on 7 Aban 1334 (30 October 1955)."

PAKISTAN

"The Government of Pakistan will permit for a period of fifteen years after the coming into effect of the said Protocol: (i) the use of opium for quasi-medical purposes; and (ii) the production of opium and/or import thereof from India or Iran for such purposes."

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Australia	13 Jan 1955	Norfolk Island, Papua, Trust Territory of Naura and Trust Territory of New Guinea
Belgium	30 Jun 1958	Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi
France	21 Apr 1954	Territories of the French Union
New Zealand	2 Nov 1956	Cook Islands, Niue, Tokelau Islands and Trust Territory of Western Samoa
South Africa	29 Dec 1953	South West Africa
United States of	18 Feb 1955	All areas for the international relations of which the United

Participant	Date of receipt of the notification	Territories
America		States is responsible

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fourteenth Session, Supplement No. 1* (E/2332), p. 28.

[2] The Protocol had been signed on behalf of the Republic of Viet-Nam on 23 June 1953. See also note 1 under "Viet Nam" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Signed and ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 18 September 1953 and 25 May 1954, respectively. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned signature and/or ratification, the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Czechoslovakia, Denmark, India, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Yugoslavia stated that, since their Governments did not recognize the Nationalist Chinese authorities as the Government of China, they could not regard the said signature or ratification as valid. The Permanent Missions of Czechoslovakia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics further stated that the sole authorities entitled to act for China and the Chinese people in the United Nations and in international relations, and to sign, ratify, accede or denounce treaties, conventions and agreements on behalf of China, were the Government of the People's Republic of China and its duly appointed representatives.

In a note addressed to the Secretary-General, the Permanent Mission of China to the United Nations stated that the Government of the Republic of China was the only legal Government which represented China and the Chinese people in international relations and that, therefore, the allegations made in the above-mentioned communications as to the lack of validity of the signature or ratification in question had no legal foundation whatever.

[4] See note 1 under "Germany" concerning Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] The instrument of denunciation of the Protocol was deposited by the Government of New Zealand on 17 December 1968 in respect of the metropolitan territory of New Zealand and in respect of the Cook Islands, Niue and Tokelau Islands, the denunciation to take effect on 1 January 1969.

[8] The former Yugoslavia had signed the Protocol on 24 June 1953. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

15. SINGLE CONVENTION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS, 1961

New York, 30 March 1961

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 13 December 1964, in accordance with article 41.
REGISTRATION: 13 December 1964, No. 7515.
STATUS: Signatories: 61. Parties: 153.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 520, p. 151, vol. 557, p. 280 (corrigendum to the Russian text), vol. 570, p. 346 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic Russian text), and vol. 590, p. 325 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic Spanish text).

Note: The Convention was adopted and opened for signature by the United Nations Conference for the Adoption of a Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, held at United Nations Headquarters, New York, from 24 January to 25 March 1961. The Conference was convened pursuant to resolution 689 J (XXVI)[1] of 28 July 1958 of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. The Conference also adopted the Final Act and five resolutions for the text of which, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 520, p. 151. For the proceedings of the Conference, see *Official Records of the United Nations Conference for the Adoption of a Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs* volumes I and II, United Nations publications, Sales Nos. 63.XI.4 and 63.XI.5.

Participant[2,3,4,5]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Afghanistan	30 Mar 1961	19 Mar 1963
Algeria		7 Apr 1965 a
Angola		26 Oct 2005 a
Antigua and Barbuda		5 Apr 1993 a
Argentina	31 Jul 1961	10 Oct 1963
Australia	30 Mar 1961	1 Dec 1967
Austria		1 Feb 1978 a
Azerbaijan		11 Jan 1999 a
Bahamas		13 Aug 1975 d
Bangladesh		25 Apr 1975 a
Barbados		21 Jun 1976 d
Belarus	31 Jul 1961	20 Feb 1964
Belgium	28 Jul 1961	17 Oct 1969
Benin	30 Mar 1961	27 Apr 1962
Botswana		27 Dec 1984 a
Brazil	30 Mar 1961	18 Jun 1964
Brunei Darussalam		25 Nov 1987 a
Bulgaria	31 Jul 1961	25 Oct 1968
Burkina Faso		16 Sep 1969 a
Cambodia	30 Mar 1961	7 Jul 2005
Cameroon		15 Jan 1962 a
Canada	30 Mar 1961	11 Oct 1961
Chad	30 Mar 1961	29 Jan 1963
Chile	30 Mar 1961	7 Feb 1968
Colombia		3 Mar 1975 a
Congo	30 Mar 1961	3 Mar 2004
Costa Rica	30 Mar 1961	7 May 1970
Côte d'Ivoire		10 Jul 1962 a
Croatia[6]		26 Jul 1993 d
Cuba		30 Aug 1962 a
Cyprus		30 Jan 1969 a
Czech Republic[7]		30 Dec 1993 d
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		19 Mar 2007 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo	28 Apr 1961	19 Nov 1973
Denmark	30 Mar 1961	15 Sep 1964
Djibouti		22 Feb 2001 a
Dominica		24 Sep 1993 a
Dominican Republic		26 Sep 1972 a
Ecuador		14 Jan 1964 a
Egypt	30 Mar 1961	20 Jul 1966
El Salvador	30 Mar 1961	26 Feb 1998
Eritrea		30 Jan 2002 a
Ethiopia		29 Apr 1965 a
Fiji		1 Nov 1971 d
Finland	30 Mar 1961	6 Jul 1965
France		19 Feb 1969 a
Gabon		29 Feb 1968 a
Gambia		23 Apr 1996 a
Germany[8,9]	31 Jul 1961	3 Dec 1973
Ghana	30 Mar 1961	15 Jan 1964
Greece		6 Jun 1972 a
Guatemala	26 Jul 1961	1 Dec 1967
Guinea		7 Oct 1968 a
Guinea-Bissau		27 Oct 1995 a
Guyana		15 Jul 2002 a
Haiti	3 Apr 1961	29 Jan 1973
Holy See	30 Mar 1961	1 Sep 1970

Participant[2,3,4,5]	Signature		Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)	
Honduras			16 Apr	1973 a
Hungary	31 Jul	1961	24 Apr	1964
Iceland			18 Dec	1974 a
India	30 Mar	1961	13 Dec	1964
Indonesia	28 Jul	1961	3 Sep	1976
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	30 Mar	1961	30 Aug	1972
Iraq	30 Mar	1961	29 Aug	1962
Ireland			16 Dec	1980 a
Israel			23 Nov	1962 a
Italy	4 Apr	1961	14 Apr	1975
Jamaica			29 Apr	1964 a
Japan	26 Jul	1961	13 Jul	1964
Jordan	30 Mar	1961	15 Nov	1962
Kazakhstan			29 Apr	1997 a
Kenya			13 Nov	1964 a
Kuwait			16 Apr	1962 a
Kyrgyzstan			7 Oct	1994 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic			22 Jun	1973 a
Latvia			16 Jul	1993 a
Lebanon	30 Mar	1961	23 Apr	1965
Lesotho			4 Nov	1974 d
Liberia	30 Mar	1961	13 Apr	1987
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya			27 Sep	1978 a
Liechtenstein[10]	14 Jul	1961	31 Oct	1979
Lithuania			28 Feb	1994 a
Luxembourg	28 Jul	1961	27 Oct	1972
Madagascar	30 Mar	1961	20 Jun	1974
Malawi			8 Jun	1965 a
Malaysia			11 Jul	1967 a
Mali			15 Dec	1964 a
Marshall Islands			9 Aug	1991 a
Mauritius			18 Jul	1969 d
Mexico	24 Jul	1961	18 Apr	1967
Micronesia (Federated States of)			29 Apr	1991 a
Monaco			14 Aug	1969 a
Mongolia			6 May	1991 a
Montenegro[11]			23 Oct	2006 d
Morocco			4 Dec	1961 a
Mozambique			8 Jun	1998 a
Myanmar	30 Mar	1961	29 Jul	1963
Netherlands[12]	31 Jul	1961	16 Jul	1965
New Zealand[13]	30 Mar	1961	26 Mar	1963
Nicaragua	30 Mar	1961	21 Jun	1973
Niger			18 Apr	1963 a
Nigeria	30 Mar	1961	6 Jun	1969
Norway	30 Mar	1961	1 Sep	1967
Oman			24 Jul	1987 a
Pakistan	30 Mar	1961	9 Jul	1965
Panama	30 Mar	1961	4 Dec	1963
Papua New Guinea			28 Oct	1980 d
Paraguay	30 Mar	1961	3 Feb	1972
Peru[14]	30 Mar	1961	22 Jul	1964
Philippines	30 Mar	1961	2 Oct	1967
Poland	31 Jul	1961	16 Mar	1966
Portugal[3,15]	30 Mar	1961	30 Dec	1971
Republic of Korea	30 Mar	1961	13 Feb	1962
Republic of Moldova			15 Feb	1995 a
Romania			14 Jan	1974 a
Russian Federation	31 Jul	1961	20 Feb	1964
San Marino			10 Oct	2000 a
Sao Tome and Principe			20 Jun	1996 a
Saudi Arabia			21 Apr	1973 a
Senegal			24 Jan	1964 a
Serbia[6]			12 Mar	2001 d
Seychelles			27 Feb	1992 a
Singapore			15 Mar	1973 a
Slovakia[7]			28 May	1993 d
Solomon Islands			17 Mar	1982 d
Somalia			9 Jun	1988 a
South Africa			16 Nov	1971 a
Spain	27 Jul	1961	1 Mar	1966
Sri Lanka			11 Jul	1963 a
St. Kitts and Nevis			9 May	1994 a
St. Lucia			5 Jul	1991 d
St. Vincent and the Grenadines			3 Dec	2001 d
Sudan			24 Apr	1974 a
Suriname			29 Mar	1990 d
Sweden	3 Apr	1961	18 Dec	1964
Switzerland	20 Apr	1961	23 Jan	1970
Syrian Arab Republic			22 Aug	1962 a
Thailand	24 Jul	1961	31 Oct	1961
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[16]			13 Oct	1993 a

Participant[2,3,4,5]	Signature	Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)
Togo		6 May 1963 a
Tonga		5 Sep 1973 d
Trinidad and Tobago		22 Jun 1964 a
Tunisia	30 Mar 1961	8 Sep 1964
Turkey		23 May 1967 a
Turkmenistan		21 Feb 1996 a
Uganda		15 Apr 1988 a
Ukraine	31 Jul 1961	15 Apr 1964
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[4]	30 Mar 1961	2 Sep 1964
United States of America		25 May 1967 a
Uruguay		31 Oct 1975 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	30 Mar 1961	14 Feb 1969
Zambia		12 Aug 1965 a
Zimbabwe		1 Dec 1998 d

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ALGERIA

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria does not approve the present wording of article 42 which might prevent the application of the Convention to "non-metropolitan" territories.

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 48, paragraph 2, which prescribe the compulsory referral of any dispute to the International Court of Justice.

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria declares that the agreement of all parties to a dispute shall in every case be necessary for the referral thereof to the International Court of Justice.

ARGENTINA[17]

Reservation to article 48, paragraph 2:

The Argentine Republic does not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

AUSTRIA

"The Republic of Austria interprets article 36, paragraph 1, as follows: The obligation of the Party contained therein may also be implemented by administrative regulations providing adequate sanction for the offences enumerated therein."

BANGLADESH

"[Subject to the reservations] referred to in article 49 (1) (a), (d) and (e) of the Convention, namely, subject to the right of the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to permit temporarily in its territory:

(a) The quasi-medical use of opium,

(d) The use of cannabis, cannabis resin, extracts and tinctures of cannabis for non-medical purposes, and

(e) The production and manufacture of and trade in the drugs referred to under (a) and (d) above for the purposes mentioned therein."

BELARUS

The Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic will not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3; article 13, paragraph 2; article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2; and article 31, paragraph 1 (b) of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs as applied to States not entitled to become Parties to the Single Convention on the basis of the procedure provided for in article 40 of that Convention.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic deems it essential to draw attention to the discriminatory character of article 40, paragraph 1, of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, under the terms of which certain States are not entitled to become Parties to the said Convention. The Single Convention concerns matters which are of interest to all States and has as its objective the enlistment of the efforts of all countries in the struggle against the social evil of the abuse of narcotics. The Convention should therefore be open to all countries. According to the principle of the sovereign equality of States, no States have the right to deny to other countries the possibility of participating in a Convention of this type.

BULGARIA[18]

Declaration

"The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers it necessary to stress that the wording of article 40, paragraph 1; article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3; article 13, paragraph 2; article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2; and article 31, paragraph 1 "b" has a discriminatory character as it excludes the participation of a certain number of States. These texts are obviously inconsistent with the character of the Convention, aiming at unifying the efforts of all Parties with a view to achieving regulation of the questions, affecting the interests of all countries in this field."

CZECH REPUBLIC[7]

EGYPT[19]

FRANCE

The Government of the French Republic declares that it accedes to this Convention while reserving the possibility provided for in article 44, paragraph 2 *in fine* of continuing in force article 9 of the Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs, signed at Geneva on 26 June 1936.

HUNGARY[20]

"(2) As regards countries which have been deprived of the possibility of becoming parties, on the basis of the provisions of article 40 of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, to the Convention, the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic does not consider as obligatory upon herself points 2 and 3 of article 12, point 2 of article 13, points 1 and 2 of article 14 and sub-point 1 (b) of article 31.

"The Hungarian People's Republic deems it necessary to state that the provisions in article 40 of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs by which certain States are barred from becoming Parties to the Convention are at variance with the principle of sovereign equality of States and are detrimental to the interests attached to the universality of the Convention."

INDIA

Reservations:

"Subject to the reservations referred to in Article 49 (1) (a), (b), (d) and (e) of the Convention, namely, subject to the right of the Government of India to permit temporarily in any of its territories:

"(a) The quasi-medical use of opium,

"(b) Opium smoking,

"(d) The use of cannabis, cannabis resin, extracts and tinctures of cannabis for non-medical purposes, and

"(e) The production and manufacture of and trade in the drugs referred to under (a), (b), and " (d) above for the purposes mentioned therein.

Declarations:

"Since the Government of India do not recognise the Nationalist Chinese authorities as the competent Government of China, they cannot regard signature of the said Convention by a Nationalist Chinese Representative as a valid signature on behalf of China."

INDONESIA[21]

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratifica tion:

"(1) . . .

"(2) . . .

"(3) With respect to article 48, paragraph 2, the Indonesian Government does not consider itself bound by the provisions of this paragraph which provide for a mandatory reference to the International Court of Justice of any dispute which cannot be resolved according to the terms of paragraph 1. The Indonesian Government takes the position that for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision the agreement of all the parties to the dispute shall be necessary in each individual case."

LIECHTENSTEIN

The Principality of Liechtenstein maintains in force article 9 of the Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs, signed at Geneva on 26 June 1936.

MYANMAR

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratifica tion:

"Subject to the understanding that the Shan State is being allowed to have reservation of the right:

"(1) To allow addicts in the Shan State to smoke opium for a transitory period of 20 years with effect from the date of coming into force of this Single Convention;

"(2) To produce and manufacture opium for the above purpose;

"(3) To furnish a list of opium consumers in the Shan State after the Shan State Government has completed the taking of such list on the 31st December, 1963."

NETHERLANDS

In view of the equality from the point of view of public law between the Netherlands, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles, the term "non-metropolitan" mentioned in article 42 of this Convention no longer has its original meaning so far as Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles are concerned, and will consequently be deemed to mean "non-European".

PAKISTAN

"The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan will permit temporarily in any of its territories:

"(i) The quasi-medical use of opium;

"(ii) The use of cannabis, cannabis resin, extracts and tinctures of cannabis for non-medical purposes, and

"(iii) The production and manufacture of and trade in the drugs referred to under (i) and (ii) above."

PAPUA NEW GUINEA[22]

"In accordance with article 50, paragraph 2, the Government of Papua New Guinea hereby lodges a reservation in relation to article 48, paragraph 2, which provides for reference of a dispute to the International Court of Justice."

POLAND

"The Government of the Polish People's Republic does not consider itself being bound by the provisions of article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3, article 13, paragraph 2, article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2 and article 31, paragraph 1 (b) of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, and concerning States deprived of the opportunity to participate in the above Convention.

"In the opinion of the Government of the Polish People's Republic it is inadmissible to impose obligations contained in the mentioned provisions, upon States which in result of other provisions of the same Convention may be deprived of the opportunity to adhere to it.

"The Polish People's Republic deems it appropriate to draw the attention to the discriminatory character of article 40, paragraph 1, of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, on the basis of which certain States have been deprived of the opportunity of becoming Parties to this Convention. The Single Convention deals with the question of interest to all States and is meant to mobilize efforts of all countries in the struggle against the social danger which is the abuse of narcotic drugs. This Convention therefore should be open to all States. In accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, no State has the right to deprive any other State of the opportunity to participate in a Convention of such type."

ROMANIA[23]

Reservations:

(a) ...

(b) The Socialist Republic of Romania does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3; article 13, paragraph 2; article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2; article 31, paragraph 1 (b), in so far as those provisions refer to States which are not Parties to the Single Convention.

Declarations:

(a) The Council of State of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the maintenance of the state of dependence of certain territories to which the provisions of article 42 and article 46, paragraph 1, of the Convention apply is not in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the documents adopted by the United Nations concerning the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, including the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, unanimously adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in its resolution 2625 (XXV) of 1970, which solemnly proclaims the obligation of States to promote realization of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in order to bring an end to colonialism without delay.

(b) The Council of State of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the provisions of article 40 of the Convention are not in accordance with the principle that international multilateral treaties, the aims and objectives of which concern the international community as a whole, should be open to participation by all States.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3, article 13, paragraph 2, article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2 and article 31, paragraph 1 (b) of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs as applied to States not entitled to become Parties to the Single Convention on the basis of the procedure provided for in article 40 of that Convention.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics deems it essential to draw attention to the discriminatory character of article 40, paragraph 1, of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, under the terms of which certain States are not entitled to become Parties to the said Convention. The Single Convention concerns matters which are of interest to all States and has as its objective the enlistment of the efforts of all countries in the struggle against the social evil of the abuse of narcotics. The Convention should therefore be open to all countries. According to the principle of the sovereign equality of States, no States have the right to deny to other countries the possibility of participating in a Convention of this type.

SAUDI ARABIA[24]

"The accession of the Government of Saudi Arabia to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs shall not be construed as implying recognition of the so-called State of Israel nor does the accession, in any way, imply the intention of the Government of Saudi Arabia to enter into any intercourse whatsoever with the latter in matters bearing on this Convention."

SLOVAKIA[7]

SOUTH AFRICA

"Subject to a reservation in respect of article 48 of the Convention, as provided for in article 50, paragraph 2."

SRI LANKA

The Government of Ceylon notified the Secretary-General that in respect of article 17 of the Convention, "the existing administration will be maintained for the purpose of applying the provisions of the Convention without setting up a 'special administration' for the purpose."

The Government added that this was to be considered a statement and not a reservation.

SWITZERLAND

Switzerland maintains in force article 9 of the Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs, signed at Geneva on 26 June 1936.

UKRAINE

The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic will not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3; article 13, paragraph 2; article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2; and article 31, paragraph 1 (b) of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs as applied to States not entitled to become Parties to the Single Convention on the basis of the procedure provided for in article 40 of that Convention.

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic deems it essential to draw attention to the discriminatory character of article 40, paragraph 1, of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, under the terms of which certain States are not entitled to become Parties to the said Convention. The Single Convention concerns matters which are of interest to all States and has as its objective the enlistment of the efforts of all countries in the struggle against the social evil of the abuse of narcotics. The Convention should therefore be open to all countries. According to the principle of the sovereign equality of States, no States have the right to deny to other countries the possibility of participating in a Convention of this type.

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Australia	1 Dec 1967	All non-metropolitan territories for the international relations of which Australia is responsible, namely, the territories of Papua, Norfolk Island, Christmas Island, Cocos (Keeling) Islands, Heard and MacDonald Islands, Ashmore and Cartier Islands, the Australian Antarctic Territory and the Trust Territories of New Guinea and Nauru
France	19 Feb 1969	The whole of the territory of the French Republic

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
India	13 Dec 1964	Sikkim
Netherlands[12]	16 Jul 1965	For the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles
New Zealand[13]	26 Mar 1963	Cook Islands (including Niue) and the Tokelau Islands, being non-metropolitan territories for the international relations of which the Government of New Zealand is responsible
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[4,25]	26 Jan 1965	Antigua, Bahamas, Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, British Virgin Islands, Brunei, Cayman Islands, Dominica, Falkland Islands (Malvinas), Grenada, Hong Kong, Mauritius, Montserrat, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Southern Rhodesia, St. Christopher-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Helena, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Swaziland, Tonga and Turks and Caicos Islands
	27 May 1965	Colony of Aden and Protectorate of South Arabia
	3 May 1966	Barbados
	24 Jun 1977	Channel Islands and Isle of Man
United States of America	25 May 1967	All areas for the international relations of which the United States is responsible

---

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Twenty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 1* (E/3169), p. 17.

[2] Signed and ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 30 March 1961 and 12 May 1969 respectively. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). See also the declaration made by the Government of India upon ratification.

[3] On 27 April 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General that the Convention would apply to Macao.

Subsequently, on 19 October and 21 October 1999, the Secretary-General received communications regarding the status of Macao from China and Portugal (see also note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portgual" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

In addition, the communication by the Government of the People's Republic of China contained the following reservation:

The Government of the People's Republic of China has reservation to paragraph 2 of Article 48 of the Convention.

Within the above ambit, the Government of the People's Republic of China will assume the responsibility for the international rights and obligations that place on a Party to the Convention.

[4] See note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] The Republic of Viet-Nam had acceded to the Convention on 14 September 1970. In this regard, see also note 1 under "Viet Nam" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 23 November 1970, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Albania had stated that the Albanian Government considered the above-mentioned accession to be without any legal validity, since the only representative of the people of South Viet-Nam qualified to speak on its behalf and to enter into international commitments were the Provisional Revolution ary Government of the Republic of South Viet-Nam.

A similar communication was received by the Secretary-General on 11 January 1971 from the Permanent Representative of the Mongolian People's Republic to the United Nations.

[6] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 30 March 1961 and 27 August 1963, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 31 July 1961 and 20 March 1964, respectively, with reservations. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 520, pp. 361 and 412. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 2 December 1975 with reservations and declarations. For the text of the reservations and declarations see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 987, p. 425.

The Secretary-General had also received on 15 March 1976 a communication from the Government of the German Democratic Republic stating in part as follows:

In acceding to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 30 March 1961, the German Democratic Republic started solely from the provisions on accession to this Convention as set forth in its article 40. There was no intention of acceding to the Convention as amended by the Protocol of 25 March 1972.

Later, upon its accession to the 1972 Protocol, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared that the said communication was to be considered as withdrawn.

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] By a communication received by the Secretary-General on 11 March 1980, the Government of Liechtenstein confirmed that it was not its intention to become a Party to the Convention as modified by the Protocol of 23 March 1972.

[11] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[12] For the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[13] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[14] In the instrument of ratification, the Government of Peru withdrew the reservation made on its behalf at the time of signing the Convention; for the text of that reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 520, p. 376.

[15] See note 1 under "Uganda" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[16] On 12 April 1994, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Greece the following communication:

"Accession of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Single [Convention on] Narcotic Drugs of the United Nations of 1961 does not imply its recognition on behalf of the Hellenic Republic."

See also note 1 under "Greece" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[17] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 24 October 1979, the Government of Argentina declared that it withdrew the reservation relating to article 49 of the Convention. (For the text of that reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 520, p. 353.)

[18] For the text of reservations as formulated by the Government of Bulgaria in respect of the same articles of the Convention at the time of its signature, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 520, p. 355.

In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservations made by Bulgaria upon ratification with respect to article 48 (2). For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 649, p. 362.

[19] In a notification received on 18 January 1980, the Government of Egypt informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the declaration relating to Israel. For the text of the said declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 568 p. 364. The notification indicates 25 January 1980 as the effective date of the withdrawal.

A communication was received by the Secretary-General on 21 September 1966 from the Government of Israel with reference to the above-mentioned declaration. For the text of the communication see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 573,p. 347.

[20] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation in respect of article 48 (2) of the Convention made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 520, p. 364.

[21] In its instrument of ratification the Government of Indonesia withdraws the declarations made upon signature regarding its intention to make reservations with respect to article 40 (1) and article 42 of the said Convention. For the text of these declarations, corresponding to paragraphs 1 and 2, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 520, p. 368.

[22] Inasmuch as the reservation in question was not formulated by Australia at the time the Convention was originally extended to Papua and New Guinea, it will become effective on the date when it would have done so, pursuant to article 41 (2) and 50 (2) of the Convention, had it been formulated on accession, that is to say the thirtieth day after the deposit of the notification of succession by the Government of Papua New Guinea, i.e., on 27 November 1980.

[23] In a communication received on 19 September 2007, the Government of Romania notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation in respect of article 48 (2) of the Convention made upon accession. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 908, p. 91.

[24] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 23 May 1972 the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations made the following declaration:

"The Government of Israel has noted the political character of the reservation made by the Government of Saudi Arabia on that occasion. In the view of the Government of Israel, this Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. Moreover, the said pronouncement by the Government of Saudi Arabia cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Saudi Arabia, under general international law or under particular treaties. The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Saudi Arabia an attitude of complete reciprocity."

[25] On 3 October 1983, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following objection :

[The Government of Argentina makes a] formal objection to the declaration of territorial extension issued by the United Kingdom with regard to the Malvinas Islands (and dependencies), which that country is illegally occupying and refers to as the "Falkland Islands".

The Argentine Republic rejects and considers null and void the [said declaration] of territorial extension.

With reference to the above-mentioned objection the Secretary-General received, on 28 February 1985, from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following declaration:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to their right, by notification to the Depositary under the relevant provisions of the above-mentioned Convention, to extend the application of the Convention in question to the Falkland Islands or to the Falkland Islands Dependencies, as the case may be.

For this reason alone, the Government of the United Kingdom are unable to regard the Argentine [communication] under reference as having any legal effect."

16. CONVENTION ON PSYCHOTROPIC SUBSTANCES

Vienna, 21 February 1971

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 16 August 1976, in accordance with article 26(1).
REGISTRATION: 16 August 1976, No. 14956.
STATUS: Signatories: 34. Parties: 183.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1019, p. 175 (including procès-verbal of rectification of the English and Russian authentic texts).

Note: The Convention was adopted and opened for signature by the United Nations Conference for the Adoption of a Protocol on Psychotropic Substances, held at Vienna from 11 January to 21 February 1971. The Conference was convened pursuant to resolution 1474 (XLVIII)[1] of 24 March 1970 of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Definitive signature(s), Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Afghanistan		21 May 1985 a
Albania		24 Jan 2003 a
Algeria		14 Jul 1978 a
Andorra		13 Feb 2007 a
Angola		26 Oct 2005 a
Antigua and Barbuda		5 Apr 1993 a
Argentina	21 Feb 1971	16 Feb 1978
Armenia		13 Sep 1993 a
Australia	23 Dec 1971	19 May 1982
Austria		23 Jun 1997 a
Azerbaijan		11 Jan 1999 a
Bahamas		31 Aug 1987 a
Bahrain		7 Feb 1990 a
Bangladesh		11 Oct 1990 a
Barbados		28 Jan 1975 a
Belarus	30 Dec 1971	15 Dec 1978
Belgium		25 Oct 1995 a
Belize		18 Dec 2001 a
Benin		6 Nov 1973 a
Bhutan		18 Aug 2005 a
Bolivia		20 Mar 1985 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[3]		1 Sep 1993 d
Botswana		27 Dec 1984 a
Brazil	21 Feb 1971	14 Feb 1973
Brunei Darussalam		24 Nov 1987 a
Bulgaria		18 May 1972 a
Burkina Faso		20 Jan 1987 a
Burundi		18 Feb 1993 a
Cambodia		7 Jul 2005 a
Cameroon		5 Jun 1981 a
Canada		10 Sep 1988 a
Cape Verde		24 May 1990 a
Central African Republic		15 Oct 2001 a
Chad		9 Jun 1995 a
Chile	21 Feb 1971	18 May 1972
China[4,5,6]		23 Aug 1985 a
Colombia		12 May 1981 a
Comoros		1 Mar 2000 a
Congo		3 Mar 2004 a
Costa Rica	2 Sep 1971	16 Feb 1977
Côte d'Ivoire		11 Apr 1984 a
Croatia[3]		26 Jul 1993 d
Cuba		26 Apr 1976 a
Cyprus		26 Nov 1973 a
Czech Republic[7]		30 Dec 1993 d
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		19 Mar 2007 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo		12 Oct 1977 a
Denmark	21 Feb 1971	18 Apr 1975
Djibouti		22 Feb 2001 a
Dominica		24 Sep 1993 a
Dominican Republic		19 Nov 1975 a
Ecuador		7 Sep 1973 a
Egypt	21 Feb 1971	14 Jun 1972
El Salvador		11 Jun 1998 a
Eritrea		30 Jan 2002 a
Estonia		5 Jul 1996 a
Ethiopia		23 Jun 1980 a
Fiji		25 Mar 1993 a
Finland	15 Oct 1971	20 Nov 1972
France[8]	17 Dec 1971	28 Jan 1975

***Participant*[2]**	***Signature***	***Definitive signature(s), Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)***
Gabon		14 Oct 1981 a
Gambia		23 Apr 1996 a
Georgia		8 Jan 1998 a
Germany[9,10]	23 Dec 1971	2 Dec 1977
Ghana	21 Feb 1971	10 Apr 1990
Greece	21 Feb 1971	10 Feb 1977
Grenada		25 Apr 1980 a
Guatemala		13 Aug 1979 a
Guinea		27 Dec 1990 a
Guinea-Bissau		27 Oct 1995 a
Guyana	21 Feb 1971	4 May 1977
Holy See	21 Feb 1971	7 Jan 1976
Honduras		23 May 2005 a
Hungary	30 Dec 1971	19 Jul 1979
Iceland		18 Dec 1974 a
India		23 Apr 1975 a
Indonesia		19 Dec 1996 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	21 Feb 1971	9 Aug 2000
Iraq		17 May 1976 a
Ireland		7 Aug 1992 a
Israel		10 Jun 1993 a
Italy		27 Nov 1981 a
Jamaica		6 Oct 1989 a
Japan	21 Dec 1971	31 Aug 1990
Jordan		8 Aug 1975 a
Kazakhstan		29 Apr 1997 a
Kenya		18 Oct 2000 a
Kuwait		13 Jul 1979 a
Kyrgyzstan		7 Oct 1994 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		22 Sep 1997 a
Latvia		16 Jul 1993 a
Lebanon	21 Feb 1971	15 Dec 1994
Lesotho		23 Apr 1975 a
Liberia	21 Feb 1971	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		24 Apr 1979 a
Liechtenstein		24 Nov 1999 a
Lithuania		28 Feb 1994 a
Luxembourg		7 Feb 1991 a
Madagascar		20 Jun 1974 a
Malawi		9 Apr 1980 a
Malaysia		22 Jul 1986 a
Maldives		7 Sep 2000 a
Mali		31 Oct 1995 a
Malta		22 Feb 1990 a
Marshall Islands		9 Aug 1991 a
Mauritania		24 Oct 1989 a
Mauritius		8 May 1973 a
Mexico		20 Feb 1975 a
Micronesia (Federated States of)		29 Apr 1991 a
Monaco	21 Feb 1971	6 Jul 1977
Mongolia		15 Dec 1999 a
Montenegro[11]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		11 Feb 1980 a
Mozambique		8 Jun 1998 a
Myanmar[12]		21 Sep 1995 a
Namibia		31 Mar 1998 a
Nepal		9 Feb 2007 a
Netherlands[13]		8 Sep 1993 a
New Zealand[14]	13 Sep 1971	7 Jun 1990
Nicaragua		24 Oct 1973 a
Niger		10 Nov 1992 a
Nigeria		23 Jun 1981 a
Norway		18 Jul 1975 a
Oman		3 Jul 1997 a
Pakistan		9 Jun 1977 a
Palau		19 Aug 1998 a
Panama		18 Feb 1972 a
Papua New Guinea		20 Nov 1981 a
Paraguay[15]	28 Jul 1971	3 Feb 1972
Peru		28 Jan 1980 a
Philippines		7 Jun 1974 a
Poland	30 Dec 1971	3 Jan 1975
Portugal[6]		20 Apr 1979 a
Qatar		18 Dec 1986 a
Republic of Korea		12 Jan 1978 a
Republic of Moldova		15 Feb 1995 a
Romania		21 Jan 1993 a
Russian Federation	30 Dec 1971	3 Nov 1978
Rwanda	21 Feb 1971	15 Jul 1981
San Marino		10 Oct 2000 a
Sao Tome and Principe		20 Jun 1996 a

Participant[2]	Signature	Definitive signature(s), Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)
Saudi Arabia		29 Jan 1975 a
Senegal		10 Jun 1977 a
Serbia[3]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		27 Feb 1992 a
Sierra Leone		6 Jun 1994 a
Singapore		17 Sep 1990 a
Slovakia[7]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[3]		6 Jul 1992 d
Somalia		2 Sep 1986 a
South Africa		27 Jan 1972 a
Spain[16]		20 Jul 1973 a
Sri Lanka		15 Mar 1993 a
St. Kitts and Nevis		9 May 1994 a
St. Lucia		16 Jan 2003 a
St. Vincent and the Grenadines		3 Dec 2001 a
Sudan		26 Jul 1993 a
Suriname		29 Mar 1990 a
Swaziland		3 Oct 1995 a
Sweden	21 Feb 1971	5 Dec 1972
Switzerland		22 Apr 1996 a
Syrian Arab Republic		8 Mar 1976 a
Tajikistan		26 Mar 1997 a
Thailand		21 Nov 1975 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[17]		13 Oct 1993 a
Togo	21 Feb 1971	18 May 1976
Tonga		24 Oct 1975 a
Trinidad and Tobago	21 Feb 1971	14 Mar 1979
Tunisia		23 Jul 1979 a
Turkey	21 Feb 1971	1 Apr 1981
Turkmenistan		21 Feb 1996 a
Uganda		15 Apr 1988 a
Ukraine	30 Dec 1971	20 Nov 1978
United Arab Emirates		17 Feb 1988 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[5,18]	21 Feb 1971	24 Mar 1986
United Republic of Tanzania		7 Dec 2000 a
United States of America	21 Feb 1971	16 Apr 1980
Uruguay		16 Mar 1976 a
Uzbekistan		12 Jul 1995 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	21 Feb 1971	23 May 1972
Viet Nam		4 Nov 1997 a
Yemen		25 Mar 1996 a
Zambia		28 May 1993 a
Zimbabwe		30 Jul 1993 a

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon definitive signature, ratification, accession or succession.)

AFGHANISTAN

Reservation:

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, while acceding to the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, declares that it does not consider itself bound to the provision of the second paragraph of article 31, since this paragraph calls for the submission to the International Court of Justice upon the request of one of the Parties, of differences of opinion that may arise between two or several Parties to the Convention on its interpretation and implementation.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, therefore, declares in this connection that in the event of a conflict of opinion on such cases, the issue at conflict shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice not at the request of one of the sides, but upon the agreement of all Parties concerned.

ANDORRA

Reservation:

The Principality of Andorra does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 31 which provide for a mandatory referral to the International Court of Justice of any dispute which cannot be resolved according to the terms of paragraph 1. The Government of Andorra takes the position that for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision the agreement of all the parties to the dispute shall be necessary in each individual case.

ARGENTINA

"With a reservation concerning the effects of the application of the Convention to non-metropolitan Territories whose sovereignty is in dispute, as indicated in our vote on article 27."

AUSTRALIA

"The Convention shall not apply to the non-metropolitan territories for the international relations of which Australia is responsible."

AUSTRIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Austria interprets Art. 22 as follows: In cases of a minor nature, the obligations contained in this provision may also be implemented by the creation of administrative penal regulations providing adequate sanction for the offences enumerated therein."

BAHRAIN[19]

Reservation:

With regard to article 31, paragraph 2:

"The State of Bahrain does not recognise the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice."

Declaration:

"Moreover, the accession by the State of Bahrain to the said Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith."

BANGLADESH

"The Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, having considered the Convention, hereby accedes to the afore said Convention on Psychotropic Substances, 1971, and under takes to abide by its provisions albeit having permissible reservations on paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 under article 32 of the Convention."

BELARUS

Reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic will not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 19, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971 as applied to States not entitled to become Parties to the Convention on the basis of the procedure provided for in article 25 of that Convention.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 31 of the Convention concerning the referral to the International Court of Justice of a dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention at the request of any one of the Parties to the dispute and declares that the referral of any such dispute to the International Court of Justice shall in each case require the consent of all the Parties to the dispute.

Declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Byelorussian SSR states that the provisions of article 25 of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, under the terms of which a number of States are not entitled to become Parties to the said Convention, are of a discriminatory nature and considers that in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States the Convention should be open for participation by all interested States without any discrimination or restriction.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic deems it essential to state that the provisions of article 27 of the Convention are at variance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples of the United Nations General Assembly (resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960), which proclaims the necessity of "bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations".

BRAZIL

Upon signature (confirmed upon ratification except as far as concerns the reservation to article 27):

"With a reservation to article 19, paragraphs 1 and 2, articles 27 and 31."

BULGARIA[20]

CANADA[21]

Reservation:

"Whereas Canada is desirous of acceding to the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, 1971, and whereas Canada's population includes certain small clearly determined groups who use in magical or religious rites certain psychotropic substances of plant origin included in the schedules to the said Convention, and whereas the said substance occur in plants which grow in North America but not in Canada, a reservation of any present or future application, if any, of the provisions of the said Convention to peyote is hereby made pursuant to article 32, paragraph 3 of the Convention."

CHINA

Reservation:

"1. The Chinese Government has reservation on paragraph 2, article 48 of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961 [as amended] and on paragraph 2, article 31 of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971.

Declaration:

2. The signature and ratification by the Taiwan authorities in the name of China respectively on 30 March 1961 and 12 May 1969 of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961 and their signature of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971 on 21 February 1971 are all illegal and therefore null and void."

CUBA

Reservation:

The Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cubadoes not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 31 of the Convention, since, in its view, disputes between Parties should be settled only by direct negotiation through the diplomatic channel.

Declaration:

The Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba considers that, despite the fact that the Convention deals with matters affecting the interests of all States, the provisions of article 25, paragraph 1, and article 26 of the Convention are discriminatory in character in that they deny a number of States the right of signature and accession, thus violating the principle of the sovereign equality of States.

CZECH REPUBLIC[7]

EGYPT

Upon signature:

"Subject to reservation as to:

(a) Article 19, paragraphs 1 and 2
(b) Article 27, and
(c) Article 31."

Upon ratification:

The United Arab Republic [Arab Republic of Egypt] reserves its position on article 19, paras. 1, 2 (concerning measures by the Board to ensure the execution of the provision of the Convention and its right of contestation).

The UAR [Arab Republic of Egypt] reserves its position on article 27 (concerning the existence of territories or colonies pertaining to certain states).

The UAR [Arab Republic of Egypt] reserves its position on article 31 (concerning the method of settlement of disputes between members).

FRANCE

With regard to article 31, France does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 2 and declares that disputes relating to the interpretation and application of the Convention which have not been settled through the channels provided for in paragraph 1 of the said article may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all the parties to the dispute.

GERMANY[9,22]

Reservations:

1. In respect of article 11, paragraph 2 (only regarding schedule III):

In the Federal Republic of Germany, manufacturers, wholesale distributors, importers and exporters are not required to keep records of the type described but instead to mark specifically those items in their invoices which contain substances and preparations in Schedule III. Invoices and packaging slips showing such items are to be preserved by these persons for a minimum period of five years.

2. In respect of article 11, paragraph 4:

In the Federal Republic of Germany, the persons and institutions named in this provision will keep separate files, for at least five years, of invoices showing items that contain substances and preparations in Schedule III which they have received from the persons named in article 11, paragraph 2, and will once a year determine their stock of substances and preparations in Schedule III. Any other acquisition and any disposal or removal without prescription of substances and preparations in Schedule III will be recorded separately. These records will likewise be preserved for five years.

HUNGARY[23]

Upon signature:

"The Hungarian Government avails itself of the possibility accorded to it in paragraph 2 of article 32 and makes reservations in respect of article 19, paragraphs 1 and 2, article 27 and article 31 of the present Convention."

Upon ratification:

"Reservations in respect of article 19 (1) and (2) and article 31 (2):

(a) The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider it self bound by the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 19 concerning the States which, under article 25 of the Convention, are deprived of the opportunity to become parties to the Convention."

. . .

Declarations:

"(a) The Hungarian People's Republic calls attention to the fact that article 25 of the Convention is of a discriminative nature and is at variance with the principle of sovereign equality of States and it considers that the Convention should be open to all interested States.

"(b) The Hungarian People's Republic deems it necessary to declare further that article 27 of the Convention is inconsistent with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations (resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960), which proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and un conditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations."

INDIA

"The Government of India reserve their position with regard to paragraph 2 of article 31 of the aforesaid Convention and do not consider themselves bound by the provisions of that paragraph."

INDONESIA

Reservation:

"The Republic of Indonesia, while acceding to the [said Convention] does not consider itself bound by the provision of article 31 paragraph (2) and takes the position that disputes relating to the interpretation and application of the Convention which have not been settled through the channel provided for in paragraph (1) of the said article, may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all the parties to the dispute."

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Reservation:

"The Islamic Republic of Iran reserves its position on article 31 and does not consider itself bound by the provisions of that article."

IRAQ

Reservations:

1. The Government of the Republic of Iraq hereby declare that they do not consider themselves bound by the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of article19 of the Convention inasmuch as those two paragraphs are considered to be an interference in the internal affairs of the Republic of Iraq.
2. The Government of the Republic of Iraq declare that they do not consider themselves to be bound by the provisions of paragraph (2) of article 31 of the said Convention. The Government of the Republic of Iraq consider that recourse to the International Court of Justice in a dispute to which they are party shall not be had except with their approval.

Declaration:

Entry into the above Convention by the Republic of Iraq shall, however, in no way signify recognition of Israel or be conducive to entry into any relations therewith.

KUWAIT[19]

"It is understood that the accession of the State of Kuwait to the Convention on psychotropic substances done at Vienna on the 21st of February, 1971, does not in any way mean recognition of Israel by the State of Kuwait. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel."

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA

The Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya does not consider itself bound by its provisions concerning the compulsory reference to the International Court of Justice [of] disputes resulting from this Convention.

MEXICO

The Government of Mexico, in acceding to the Convention on Psychotropic Substances adopted on 21

February 1971, makes, pursuant to the provisions of article 32, paragraph 4, of the Convention, an express reservation with regard to the application of the said international instrument, since there still exist in its territory certain indigenous ethnic groups which, in magical or religious rites, traditionally make use of wild plants which contain psychotropic substances from among those in schedule I.

MYANMAR[12]

Reservations:

"The Government of the Union of Myanmar will not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 19, paragraphs 1 and 2.

The Government wishes to express reservation on article 22, paragraph 2(b) relating to extradition and does not consider itself bound by the same.

The Government of the Union of Myanmar further wishes to express that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 31, paragraph of the Convention concerning the referral to the International Court of Justice of a dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention."

PAPUA NEW GUINEA[24]

28 October 1980

Reservations:

"The Government of Papua New Guinea in accordance with article 32, paragraph 2 of the Convention hereby lodges a reservation in relation to article 31, paragraph 2, of the Convention which provides for reference of a dispute to the International Court of Justice.

The Government of Papua New Guinea in accordance with article 32, paragraph 3 of the Convention hereby lodges a reservation in relation to article 10, paragraph 1 which provides for warnings on packages and advertising."

PERU[25]

Reservations are made with respect to articles 7 and 19 (1) and (2) of the Convention. The reservation to article 7 does not extend to the provisions relating to international trade, in accordance with the provisions of article 32 (4) of the Convention.

POLAND[26]

Reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The Government of the Polish People's Republic wishes to make reservations concerning the following provisions:

"(1) Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 19 of the above-said Convention as applicable to states deprived of the opportunities of becoming Parties to the Convention in view of the procedure provided for in Article 25 of the Convention.

"In the considered opinion of the Government of the Polish People's Republic the provisions of Article 25 of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971 are of discriminatory character. In this connection the Government of the Polish People's Republic reiterates its firm position that the above-said Convention, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of states, should be open to all interested states without any discrimination."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 19, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971 as applied to States not entitled to become Parties to the Convention on the basis of the procedure provided for in article 25 of that Convention.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 31 of the Convention concerning the referral to the International Court of Justice of a dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention at the request of any one of the Parties to the dispute and declares that the referral of any such dispute to the International Court of Justice shall in each case require the consent of all Parties to the dispute.

Declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics states that the provisions of article 25 of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, under the terms of which a number of States are not entitled to become Parties to the said Convention, are of a discriminatory nature and considers that in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States the Convention should be open for participation by all interested States without any discrimination or restriction.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics deems it essential to state that the provisions of article 27 of the Convention are at variance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples of the United Nations General Assembly (resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960), which proclaims the necessity of "bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations".

SERBIA[3]

Confirmed upon succession:

Subject to a reservation to article 27 of the Convention.

SLOVAKIA[7]

SOUTH AFRICA

"The Government of the Republic of South Africa deem it advisable to accede to the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, subject to reservations in respect of Article 19 paragraphs 1 and 2, Article 27 and Article 31 as provided for in article 32 paragraph 2 of the Convention."

TUNISIA

Reservation in respect of article 31 (2):

Any such disputes which cannot be settled in the manner prescribed shall be referred, with the agreement of all the parties to the dispute, to the International Court of Justice for decision.

TURKEY

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

Reservation with respect to article 31 (2) of the Convention, made in accordance with its article 32 (2).

UKRAINE

Reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic will not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 19, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971 as applied to States not entitled to become Parties to the Convention on the basis of the procedure provided for in article 25 of that Convention.

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 31 of the Convention concerning the referral to the International Court of Justice of a dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention at the request of any one of the Parties to the dispute and declares that the referral of any such dispute to the International Court of Justice shall in each case require the consent of all Parties to the dispute.

Declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic states that the provisions of article 25 of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, under the terms of which a number of States are not entitled to become Parties to the said Convention, are of a discriminatory nature and considers that in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States the Convention should be open for participation by all interested States without any discrimination or restriction.

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic deems it essential to state that the provisions of article 27 of the Convention are at variance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples of the United Nations General Assembly (resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960), which proclaims the necessity of "bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations".

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

" In accord with paragraph 4 of article 32 of the Convention, peyote harvested and distributed for use by the Native American Church in its religious rites is excepted from the provisions of article 7 of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances".

VIET NAM

Reservation:

[The Government of Viet Nam declares its reservation to] article 22 paragraph 2 point b on Extradition and article 31, paragraph 2 on Dispute settlement.

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-eighth Session, Resolutions* (E/4832).

[2] Amendments to Schedules I, II, III and IV annexed to the Convention (Article 2 of the Convention):

Schedule	***Decision by the Narcotics Commission***		***Date of the notification of the decision by the Narcotics Division of the Secretariat***
	No.	Date	
I-IV	6 (XXVII)	24 Feb 1977	10 Jun 1977 (NAR/CL.1/1977)
I	3 (S-V)	16 Feb 1978	20 Jun 1978 (NAR/CL.4/1978)
II, IV	4 (XXVIII)	22 Feb 1979	28 Mar 1979 (NAR/CL.3/1979)
II	4 (S-VI)	14 Feb 1980	31 Mar 1980 (NAR/CL.6/1980)
I	5 (S-VI)	14 Feb 1980	31 Mar 1980 (NAR/CL.7/1980)
IV	2 (XXIX)	4 Feb 1981	3 Apr 1981 (NAR/CL.2/1981)
IV	3 (XXIX)	4 Feb 1981	3 Apr 1981 (NAR/CL.8/1981)
IV	5 (XXIX)	4 Feb 1981	3 Apr 1981 (NAR/CL.10/1981

[3] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 21 February 1971 and 15 October 1973, respectively, with the following reservation:

"Subject to a reservation to article 27 of the Convention."

See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 21 February 1971. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China, preface (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[5] On 6 and 10 June 1997, respectively, Secretary-General received communications regarding the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (see note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

In addition, the communication made by the Government of China contained the following declaration:

1. The reservation to paragraph 2, article [31], of the said Convention made by the Government of the People's Republic of China will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

2. In accordance with article 28 of the Convention, the Government of the People's Republic of China declares that the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region is a separate region for the purpose of the Convention.

[6] On 13 September 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General that the Convention will apply to Macao.

Subsequently, on 18 November and 3 December 1999, the Secretary-General received communications regarding the status of Macao from China and Portugal (see also note 3 under “China” and note 1 under “Portgual” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with the reservation and declaration made by China will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

In addition, the communication by the Government of the People's Republic of China contained the following declaration:

1. The reservation made by the Government of the People's Republic of China to paragraph 2 of Article 31 of the Convention will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

2. In accordance with Article 28 of the Convention, the Government of the People's Republic of China declares that the Macao Special Administrative Region is a separate region for the purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the People's Republic of China will assume responsibility for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Convention to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[7] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 13 October 1988, with the following reservations and declarations:

Reservations :

[The Government of Czechoslovakia] declares, in accordance with article 32, para. 2, of the Convention, that the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 19, paras. 1 and 2, of the Convention as far as they concern States that are disqualified from becoming parties to the Convention under its article 25.

[The Government of Czechoslovakia] does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 31, para. 2, of the Convention which regulates obligatory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and declares that for submission of a dispute to the International Court of Justice for decision consent of all parties to the dispute is required in every case.

Declarations:

In respect of article 25 of the Convention:"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic declares that the provisions of article 25 of the Convention are contrary to the principle of sovereign equality, and of a discriminatory nature. In this context, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic reaffirms its position that the Convention should be open for participation by all States."

In respect of article 27 of the Convention:

"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic considers it necessary also to declare that the provisions of article 27 of the Convention are at variance with the declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly resolution 1514/XV of December 14, 1960, which proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations."

Subsequently, on 22 January 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation with respect to article 31 (2) made upon accession. See also note 1 under “Czech Republic” and note 1 underkia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] With a declaration that the provisions of the Convention will apply throughout the territory of the French Republic (European and overseas departments and overseas territories).

[9] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 2 December 1975 with reservations and declarations. For the text of the reservations and declarations see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1019, p. 348. See also note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] See note 1 under “Germany” regarding Berlin (West) in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[11] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[12] On 20 June 1994, the instrument of accession by the Government of Myanmar to the Convention was received by the Secretary-General. The instrument of accession was accompanied by the following reservations:

"The Government of the Union of Myanmar will not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 19, paragraphs 1 and 2.

The Government wishes to express reservation on article 22, paragraph 2 (b) relating to extradition and does not consider itself bound by the same.

The Government of the Union of Myanmar further wishes to express that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 31, paragraph 2 of the Convention concerning the referral to the International Court of Justice of a dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention."

As regards the reservation made in respect of article 22, article 32 (3) of the Convention provides that "unless by the end of twelve months after the date of the Secretary-General's communication of the reservation concerned (i.e., 20 September 1994), this reservation has been objected to by one third of the States that have signed without reservation of ratification, ratified or acceded to this Convention before the end of that period, it shall be deemed to be permitted, it being understood however that States which have objected to the reservation need not assume towards the reserving State any legal obligation under this Convention which is affected by the reservation."

By the end of twelve months after the date of its circulation (i.e. 20 September 1994), none of the States Parties had objected to the reservation. Consequently, in accordance with article 32 (3) of the Convention, the reservation is deemed permitted and the instrument was accepted for deposit on 21 September 1995.

[13] For the Kingdom in Europe. As from 10 March 1999: for the Netherlands Antilles.

[14] With a declaration of application to Niue and Tokelau. See also note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[15] The signature on behalf of the Government of Paraguay was affixed *"Ad Referendum"* in accordance with the instructions contained in the full powers. In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 12 October 1971, the Permanent Representative of Paraguay to the United Nations indicated that the words *"Ad Referendum"* should be taken as meaning that the Convention concerned was subject to ratification by the Republic of Paraguay in accordance with its constitutional requirements and to the deposit of an instrument of ratification under article 25 of said Convention.

[16] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 20 December 1973, the Permanent Representative of Spain to the United Nations made the following statement:

Spain considers itself to be internationally responsible for the territory of the Sahara; consequently, the provisions of the 1971 Vienna Convention on Psychotropic Substances shall also apply to that territory.

[17] On 12 April 1994, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Greece the following communication:

"Accession of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, concluded at Vienna on 21 February 1971, does not imply its recognition on behalf of the Hellenic Republic."

See also note 1 under "Greece" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[18] On 13 December 1990, the Secretary-General received a communication from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the effect that the said Convention shall extend to Hong Kong *(see also note 4)* and to the British Virgin Islands and that, in accordance with article 28 thereof, Hong Kong and the British Virgin Islands are each a separate region for the purposes of the Convention.

Subsequently, on 3 June 1993, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General that the Convention shall extend to Anguilla, Bermuda, the British Antarctic Territory, the Cayman Islands, the Falkland Islands, Gibraltar, Montserrat, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, and the Turks and Caicos Islands.

In this regard, on 4 February 1994, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following declaration:

The Argentine Republic rejects the extension by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of the application of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, signed at Vienna on 21 February 1971, to the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and reaffirms its sovereignty over these islands, which are an integral part of the national territory.

Subsequently, on 4 January 1995, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General of the following:

"The British Government have no doubt about the sovereignty of the United Kingdom over the Falkland Islands, as well as South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, and have no doubt, therefore, about their right to extend the said Convention to these territories. The British Government can only reject as unfounded the claim by the Government of Argentina that these Islands are a part of Argentine territory."

Further, in a communication received on 25 November 2002, the Government of the United Kingdom informed the Secreary-Genel that the Convention would also apply to the Isle of Man. The Government of the United Kingdom further declared that:

"In accordance with Article 28 thereof, [the United Kingdom] further declare[s], that the Isle of Man and the following territories to which the Convention was extended on 3 June 1993: Anguilla, Bermuda, British Antarctic Territory, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands, Gibraltar, Montserrat, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands are each a separate region for the purpose of the Convention."

In this regard, on 20 February 2003, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina, the following communication:

The Argentine Republic reiterates what was stated in its note of 4 February 1994, by which it rejected the declaration of territorial application of the above-mentioned Convention made on 3 June 1993 by the United Kingdom in respect of the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, which are an integral part of the national territory of Argentina. It also rejects the declaration of the United Kingdom purporting to extend the application of the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances to the sector which it refers to as "British Antarctic Territory" and affirms that this declaration in no way affects the rights of sovereignty of the Argentine Republic over the Argentine Antarctic Sector.

Furthermore, the Argentine Republic rejects the declaration made by the United Kingdom in its note of 3 December 2002 and any other document, act or activity and their effects, which might arise from that declaration and from the purported territorial application, as well as the designation of these territories as dependencies of the United Kingdom.

The United Nations General Assembly adopted resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25, in which it recognizes the existence of the sovereignty dispute relating to the question of the Malvinas Islands urges the Governments of the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom to resume negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful and definitive settlement of the dispute, using the good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who was requested to report to the General Assembly on the progress made.

The Argentine Republic reaffirms its sovereign rights over the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands as well as the surrounding maritime areas, which are part of its national territory. It also reaffirms its rights of sovereignty over the Argentine Antarctic Sector and the validity of the Antarctic Treaty, signed in Washington on 1 December 1959.

The Argentine Government requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations to notify Contracting States and States Parties to the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of this communication. It further requests the Secretary-General to bring this communication to the attention of the International Narcotics Control Board.

On 11 April 2003: in respect of Jersey with the following declaration:

"In accordance with Article 28 thereof, I further declare that Jersey is a separate region for the purposes of the Convention."

[19] With respect to the Kuwaiti declaration, the Secretary-General received on 29 October 1979 from the Government of Israel the following communications:

"The Government of the State of Israel has noted the political character of the statement made by the Government of Kuwait. In the view of the Government of the State of Israel, this Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. Moreover, the said declaration cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Kuwait under general international law or under particular conventions. The Government of the State of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Kuwait an attitude of complete reciprocity."

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel an objection, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis* , with regard to a reservation made by Bahrain.

[20] In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession with respect to article 31. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1019, p. 346.

[21] None of the States Parties having objected to the reservation made by the Government of Canada before the expiry of a period of twelve months after the date (9 September 1987) of its circulation by the Secretary-General, the said reservation is deemed to have been permitted in accordance with the provisions of article 32.

[22] None of the States Parties having objected to the reservations made by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany before the expiry of a period of twelve months after the date (1 December 1976) of their circulation by the Secretary-General, the said reservations are deemed to have been permitted in accordance with the provisions of article 32.

[23] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation in respect to article 31 (2) made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1141, p. 457.

[24] None of the States Parties having objected to the reservation regarding article 10 (1) made by the Government of Papua New Guinea before the expiry of a period of twelve months after the date (19 November 1980) of its circulation by the Secretary-General, the said reservation is deemed to have been permitted in accordance with the provisions of article 32.

[25] The Secretary-General received, on 29 January 1981, from the Government of Peru the following clarification in respect of the reservation made to article 7:

"The reservation referred to was motivated by the following two wild plant species: Ayahuasca, a liana which grows in the Amazon region and which contains the active element N, N-dimethyltryptamine, and a columnar cactus known as San Pedro, which grows in the desert coastal regions and in the Andean region and contains mescaline. Ayahuasca is used by certain Amazon ethnic groups in magical and religious rites and in rites of initiation into adulthood; San Pedro is used in magical rites by indigenous medicine men or shamans. Because of their psychotropic content, both plant species are included in the reservation option made possible by article 32, paragraph 4, of the Convention.

[26] On 16 October 1997, the Government of Poland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with regard to article 31, paragraph 2 of the Convention made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1019, p. 175.

17. PROTOCOL AMENDING THE SINGLE CONVENTION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS, 1961

Geneva, 25 March 1972

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 8 August 1975, in accordance with article 18.
REGISTRATION: 8 August 1975, No. 14151.
STATUS: Signatories: 54. Parties: 125.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 976, p. 3.

Note: The Protocol was adopted on 24 March 1972 by the United Nations Conference to consider amendments to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, held at Geneva from 6 to 25 March 1972. The Conference was convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations pursuant to resolution 1577 (L)[1] of 20 May 1971 of the United Nations Economic and Social Council.

Participant[2,3]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Algeria		26 Feb 2003 a
Angola		26 Oct 2005 a
Antigua and Barbuda		5 Apr 1993 a
Argentina	25 Mar 1972	16 Nov 1973
Australia	22 Nov 1972	22 Nov 1972
Austria		1 Feb 1978 a
Bahamas		23 Nov 1976 a
Bangladesh		9 May 1980 a
Barbados		21 Jun 1976 a
Belarus		13 Sep 2001 a
Belgium	25 Mar 1972	13 Jun 1984
Benin		6 Nov 1973 a
Botswana		27 Dec 1984 a
Brazil	25 Mar 1972	16 May 1973
Brunei Darussalam		25 Nov 1987 a
Bulgaria		18 Jul 1996 a
Cambodia	25 Mar 1972	
Cameroon		30 May 1974 a
Canada		5 Aug 1976 a
Chile	25 Mar 1972	19 Dec 1975
Colombia		3 Mar 1975 a
Costa Rica	25 Mar 1972	14 Feb 1973
Côte d'Ivoire	25 Mar 1972	28 Feb 1973
Croatia[4]		26 Jul 1993 d
Cuba		14 Dec 1989 a
Cyprus	25 Mar 1972	30 Nov 1973
Czech Republic[5]		30 Dec 1993 d
Democratic Republic of the Congo		15 Jul 1976 a
Denmark	25 Mar 1972	18 Apr 1975
Djibouti		22 Feb 2001 a
Dominica		24 Sep 1993 a
Dominican Republic		21 Sep 1993 a
Ecuador	25 Mar 1972	25 Jul 1973
Egypt	25 Mar 1972	14 Jan 1974
Eritrea		30 Jan 2002 a
Ethiopia		11 Oct 1994 a
Fiji		21 Nov 1973 a
Finland	16 May 1972	12 Jan 1973
France[6]	25 Mar 1972	4 Sep 1975
Gabon	25 Mar 1972	
Germany[7,8]	25 Mar 1972	20 Feb 1975
Ghana	25 Mar 1972	
Greece	25 Mar 1972	12 Jul 1985
Guatemala	25 Mar 1972	9 Dec 1975
Guinea-Bissau		27 Oct 1995 a
Haiti	25 Mar 1972	29 Jan 1973
Holy See	25 Mar 1972	7 Jan 1976
Honduras		8 Aug 1979 a
Hungary		12 Nov 1987 a
Iceland		18 Dec 1974 a
India		14 Dec 1978 a
Indonesia	25 Mar 1972	3 Sep 1976
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	25 Mar 1972	18 Dec 2001
Iraq		25 Sep 1978 a
Ireland		16 Dec 1980 a
Israel	27 Mar 1972	1 Feb 1974
Italy	25 Mar 1972	14 Apr 1975
Jamaica		6 Oct 1989 a
Japan	15 Dec 1972	27 Sep 1973
Jordan	25 Mar 1972	28 Feb 1973
Kazakhstan		29 Apr 1997 a
Kenya		9 Feb 1973 a

Participant[2,3]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Kuwait		7 Nov 1973 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		16 Mar 2009 a
Latvia		16 Jul 1993 a
Lebanon	25 Mar 1972	5 Mar 1997
Lesotho		4 Nov 1974 a
Liberia	25 Mar 1972	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		27 Sep 1978 a
Liechtenstein	25 Mar 1972	24 Nov 1999
Luxembourg	25 Mar 1972	13 Oct 1976
Madagascar	25 Mar 1972	20 Jun 1974
Malawi		4 Oct 1973 a
Malaysia		20 Apr 1978 a
Mali		31 Oct 1995 a
Mauritius		12 Dec 1994 a
Mexico		27 Apr 1977 a
Monaco	25 Mar 1972	30 Dec 1975
Mongolia		6 May 1991 a
Montenegro[9]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	28 Dec 1972	19 Mar 2002
Myanmar		22 Aug 2003 a
Netherlands[10]		29 May 1987 a
New Zealand[11]	15 Dec 1972	7 Jun 1990
Nicaragua	25 Mar 1972	15 Feb 2005
Niger	28 Nov 1972	28 Dec 1973
Norway	25 Mar 1972	12 Nov 1973
Pakistan	29 Dec 1972	2 Jul 1999
Panama	18 May 1972	19 Oct 1972
Papua New Guinea		28 Oct 1980 a
Paraguay[12]	18 Oct 1972	20 Jun 1973
Peru	25 Mar 1972	12 Sep 1977
Philippines	25 Mar 1972	7 Jun 1974
Poland		9 Jun 1993 a
Portugal[3]		20 Apr 1979 a
Republic of Korea	29 Dec 1972	25 Jan 1973
Republic of Moldova		15 Feb 1995 a
Romania		14 Jan 1974 a
Russian Federation		3 Jun 1996 a
San Marino		10 Oct 2000 a
Senegal	16 Aug 1972	25 Mar 1974
Serbia[4]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		27 Feb 1992 a
Singapore		9 Jul 1975 a
Slovakia[5]		28 May 1993 d
South Africa	25 Mar 1972	16 Dec 1975
Spain	25 Mar 1972	4 Jan 1977
Sri Lanka		29 Jun 1981 a
St. Kitts and Nevis		9 May 1994 a
St. Vincent and the Grenadines		3 Dec 2001 d
Sudan		5 Jul 1994 a
Suriname		29 Mar 1990 a
Sweden	25 Mar 1972	5 Dec 1972
Switzerland		22 Apr 1996 a
Syrian Arab Republic		1 Feb 1974 a
Thailand		9 Jan 1975 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		13 Oct 1993 a
Togo	25 Mar 1972	10 Nov 1976
Tonga		5 Sep 1973 a
Trinidad and Tobago		23 Jul 1979 a
Tunisia	22 Dec 1972	29 Jun 1976
Turkey	25 Mar 1972	20 Jul 2001
Uganda		15 Apr 1988 a
Ukraine		27 Sep 2001 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[13]	25 Mar 1972	20 Jun 1978
United States of America	25 Mar 1972	1 Nov 1972
Uruguay		31 Oct 1975 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	25 Mar 1972	4 Dec 1985
Zambia		13 May 1998 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ALGERIA

Declaration:

The accession of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria to the present Protocol shall in no way signify recognition of Israel.

This accession may not be construed as leading to entry into relations of any kind with Israel.

BELGIUM

With a reservation concerning the following articles:

1. Article 5 amending article 12 (5) of the Single Convention;
2. Article 9 amending article 29 (1), (2) and (5) of the Single Convention.

BRAZIL

"Brazil wishes to take this opportunity to repeat the declaration that was made at the appropriate occasion during the plenary session of the Protocol's Negotiating Conference which took place in Geneva from March 6th to March 24th, 1972, to the effect that the amendments to article 36 of the Convention do not oblige States with laws against extradition of nationals to extradite them.

"Under the terms of article 21 of the Protocol, Brazil wishes to make it clear that it does not accept the amendment introduced by article 1 of the Protocol to article 2, para. 4, of the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs."

CANADA

"Subject to a reservation with respect to subparagraphs (i), (ii) and (iii) of paragraph 2 (b) of the amending article 14."

CUBA

The accession of the Republic of Cuba to the 1972 Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, shall not be interpreted as recognition of acceptance on the part of the Government of the Republic of Cuba to the racist Government of South Africa, which does not represent the South African people and which, because of its systematic practice of the discriminatory policy of *apartheid*, has been expelled from international agencies, condemned by the United Nations and rejected by all the peoples of the world.

The accession of the Republic of Cuba to the 1972 Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, shall not be interpreted as recognition or acceptance on the part of the Government of the Republic of Cuba of the Government of the Republic of Korea, because Cuba considers that it does not genuinely represent the interests of the Korean people.

The Government of the Republic of Cuba declares with respect to the provisions contained in article 14, paragraph (2) (b) (ii), that in accordance with its legal system, and its national laws and practice, it makes extradition conditional only on the existence of bilateral treaties.

EGYPT[14]

GREECE

"With a reservation to article 1 (4) amending the article 2 of the Single Convention."

INDIA[15]

"The Government of India reserve their position with regard to articles 5, 6, 9, 11 and 14 of the aforesaid Protocol and do not consider themselves bound by the provisions of these articles."

IRAQ[16]

This accession shall, however, in no way signify recognition of Israel or entry into any relations therewith.

ISRAEL[16]

Upon signature:

". . . The Government of Israel will not proceed to the ratification of the Protocol until it has received assurances that all the neighbouring States who intend to become parties to it will do so without reservation or declaration, and that the so-called reservation or declaration referring to Israel and made by one of Israel's neighbours in connection with its participation in the1961 Single Convention, and which was quoted at the meeting of the Second Committee on 18 March 1972, is withdrawn."

Upon ratification:

". . . The Government of the State of Israel, in accordance with the powers vested in it by the law, decided to ratify the Protocol while maintaining all its rights to adopt toward all other parties an attitude of complete reciprocity."

KUWAIT[16]

The Government of the State of Kuwait takes the view that its accession to the said Protocol does not in any way imply its recognition of Israel, nor does it oblige it to apply the provisions of the aforementioned Protocol in respect of the said country.

MEXICO

In accordance with the provisions of article 21 `Reservations' of the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, adopted in Geneva on 25 March 1972, the Government of Mexico, in acceding to that international instrument, makes an explicit reservation in respect of the application of articles 5 (amendment to article 12, paragraph 5, of the Single Convention); 6 (amendment to article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Single Convention); and 11 (new article 21 *bis* , Limitation of Production of Opium). Accordingly, as regards the articles in respect of which this reservation is made, Mexico will be bound by the corresponding texts of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, in their original form.

MONTENEGRO[9]

Confirmed upon succession:

Reservation:

With the reservations that articles 9 and 11 of the Protocol shall not apply in the territory of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

MYANMAR

Reservation:

" The Government of the Union of Myanmar wishes to express reservation on Article 6 relating to the right of International Narcotics Control Board (INCB).

The Government wishes to make a reservation on Article 14, Paragraph 2(b) to extradition and does not consider itself bound by the same in so far as its own Myanmar nations are concerned."

PANAMA

Reservation:

"With a reservation regarding article 36, paragraph 2 that appears on document of May 3, 1972 signed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Panama."

[The reservation reads as follows:

With the express reservation that the amendment which article 14 of the Protocol makes to article 36, paragraph 2, of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961 (a) does not modify the extradition treaties to which the Republic of Panama is a party in any manner which may compel it to extradite its own nationals; (b) does not require the Republic of Panama to include, in such extradition treaties as it may conclude in the future, any provision requiring it to extradite its own nationals; and (c) may not be interpreted or applied in any manner which gives rise to an obligation on the part of the Republic of Panama to extradite any of its own nationals.]

PERU

[The Government of Peru] entertains reservations concerning the last part of the second paragraph of article 5 of the Protocol, amending article 12, paragraph 5, of the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, as it considers that the powers conferred therein on the International Narcotics Control Board (INCB) are incompatible with its role as a co-ordinating body for national control systems and give it supranational supervisory functions.

ROMANIA

Reservation:

The Socialist Republic of Romania does not consider itself bound by the provisions contained in article 6, insofar as those provisions relate to States which are not parties to the Single Convention.

Declaration:

The Council of State of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the provisions of article 17 of the Protocol are not in accordance with the principle that international multilateral treaties, the aims and objectives of which concern the world community as a whole, should be open to participation by all States.

SERBIA[4]

Confirmed upon succession:

Reservation:

With the reservations that articles 9 and 11 of the Protocol shall not apply in the territory of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ISRAEL

30 September 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Algeria upon accession :

"The Government of the State of Israel has noted that the instrument of ratification of Algeria to the above mentioned Protocol contains a declaration with respect to the State of Israel. The Government of the State of Israel is of the view that such declaration, which is explicitly of a political nature, is incompatible with the purposes and objectives of this Protocol.

The Government of the State of Israel therefore objects to the aforesaid declaration made by Algeria to the Protocol of 1972 Amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961."

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[13,17]	20 Jun 1978	Bailiwick of Guernsey, the Bailiwick of Jersey, the Isle of Man, the Associated States (Antigua, Dominica, Saint Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent), Belize, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Brunei, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Gibraltar, Gilbert Islands, Hong Kong, Montserrat, Saint Helena and Dependencies, Solomon Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands and Tuvalu.

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fiftieth Session, Supplement No. 1 (E/5044),* p. 8.

[2] The Protocol had been signed on behalf of the Republic of Viet-Nam on 25 March 1972. See also 1 under "Viet Nam" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] On 12 November 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General that the Protocol will apply to Macau.

Subsequently, on 9 and 15 December 1999, the Secretary-General received communications regarding the status of Macao from China and Portugal (see also note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portgual" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Protocol will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[4] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Protocol on 25 March 1972 and 23 June 1978, respectively, with the following reservations:

With the reservations that articles 9 and 11 of the Protocol shall not apply in the territory of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Protocol on 4 June 1991. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] With a declaration that the provisions of the Protocol shall apply to the entire territory of the French Republic (European and overseas departments and overseas territories).

[7] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Protocol on 4 October 1988. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

[11] Applicable to Niue and Tokelau. See also note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[12] Upon signature on behalf of the Government of Paraguay was affixed *"Ad Referendum"* in accordance with the instructions contained in the full powers. In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 18 October 1972, the Permanent Representative of Paraguay to the United Nations confirmed that the words *"Ad Referendum"* which preceded his signature should be considered to mean that the Protocol concerned is subject to ratification by the Republic of Paraguay, in accordance with the procedure established by the National Constitution, and to deposit of the instrument of ratification, as provided in the Protocol.

[13] See note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[14] In a notification received on 18 January 1980, the Government of Egypt informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation relating to Israel. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 976, p. 101. The notification indicates 25 January 1980 as the effective date of the withdrawal.

[15] In a note received by the Secretary-General on 14 December 1978, the Government of India clarified that the reservation made with regard to article 14 of the Protocol relates only to paragraph 2 (b) of article 36 of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961.

[16] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 26 December 1973, the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations made the following statement:

"The instrument of acceptance by the Government of Kuwait of the Protocol contains a statement of a political character in respect to Israel. In the view of the Government of Israel, this is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements, which are, moreover, in flagrant contradiction to the principles, objects and purposes of the Protocol. That statement, therefore, possesses no legal validity whatsoever.

"The Government of Israel utterly rejects that statement and will proceed on the assumption that it has no validity as to the rights and duties of any State Party to the said treaties.

"The declaration of the Government of Kuwait cannot in any way affect Kuwait's obligations under whatever other obligations are binding upon that State by virtue of general international law.

"The Government of Israel, will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt toward the Government of Kuwait an attitude of complete reciprocity."

A communication, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis* , was received by the Secretary-General from the Government of Israel on 11 May 1979 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by Iraq.

[17] On 3 October 1983 the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following objection:

[The Government of Argentina makes a] formal objection to the declaration of territorial extension issued by the United Kingdom with regard to the Malvinas Islands (and dependencies), which that country is illegally occupying and refers to as the "Falkland Islands".

The Argentine Republic rejects and considers null and void the [said declaration] of territorial extension.

18. Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961

New York, 8 August 1975

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	8 August 1975, in accordance with article 18of the Protocol of 25 March 1972.
REGISTRATION:	8 August 1975, No. 14152.
STATUS:	Parties: 184.
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 976, p. 105.

Note: The text of the Convention was established by the Secretary-General in accordance with article 22 of the Protocol.

Participant	*Participation in the Convention by virtue of ratification, accession or succession to the Protocol of 25 March 1972 or to the 1961 Convention after the entry into force of the Protocol*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Albania		14 Aug 2001 a
Algeria	26 Feb 2003	
Andorra		13 Feb 2007 a
Angola	26 Oct 2005	
Antigua and Barbuda	5 Apr 1993	
Argentina	16 Nov 1973	
Armenia		13 Sep 1993 a
Australia	22 Nov 1972	
Austria	1 Feb 1978	
Azerbaijan	11 Jan 1999	
Bahamas	23 Nov 1976	
Bahrain		7 Feb 1990 a
Bangladesh	9 May 1980	
Barbados	21 Jun 1976	
Belarus	13 Sep 2001	
Belgium	13 Jun 1984	
Belize		18 Dec 2001 a
Benin	6 Nov 1973	
Bhutan		24 Aug 2005 a
Bolivia		23 Sep 1976 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1]		1 Sep 1993 d
Botswana	27 Dec 1984	
Brazil	16 May 1973	
Brunei Darussalam	25 Nov 1987	
Bulgaria	18 Jul 1996	
Burkina Faso		2 Jun 1992 a
Burundi		18 Feb 1993 a
Cambodia	7 Jul 2005	
Cameroon	30 May 1974	
Canada	5 Aug 1976	
Cape Verde		24 May 1990 a
Central African Republic		15 Oct 2001 a
Chile	19 Dec 1975	
China[2,3]		23 Aug 1985 a
Colombia	3 Mar 1975	
Comoros		1 Mar 2000 a
Congo	3 Mar 2004	
Costa Rica	14 Feb 1973	
Côte d'Ivoire	28 Feb 1973	
Croatia[1]	26 Jul 1993	
Cuba	14 Dec 1989	
Cyprus	30 Nov 1973	
Czech Republic[4]		30 Dec 1993 d
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	19 Mar 2007	
Democratic Republic of the Congo	15 Jul 1976	
Denmark	18 Apr 1975	
Djibouti	22 Feb 2001	
Dominica	24 Sep 1993	
Dominican Republic	21 Sep 1993	
Ecuador	25 Jul 1973	

Participant	*Participation in the Convention by virtue of ratification, accession or succession to the Protocol of 25 March 1972 or to the 1961 Convention after the entry into force of the Protocol*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Egypt	14 Jan 1974	
El Salvador	26 Feb 1998	
Eritrea	30 Jan 2002	
Estonia		5 Jul 1996 a
Ethiopia	11 Oct 1994	
Fiji	21 Nov 1973	
Finland	12 Jan 1973	
France	4 Sep 1975	
Gabon		14 Oct 1981 a
Gambia	23 Apr 1996	
Georgia		27 Mar 2000 a
Germany[5]	20 Feb 1975	
Ghana		10 Apr 1990 a
Greece	12 Jul 1985	
Grenada		19 Aug 1998 a
Guatemala	9 Dec 1975	
Guinea		27 Dec 1990 a
Guinea-Bissau	27 Oct 1995	
Guyana	15 Jul 2002	
Haiti	29 Jan 1973	
Holy See	7 Jan 1976	
Honduras	8 Aug 1979	
Hungary	12 Nov 1987	
Iceland	18 Dec 1974	
India	14 Dec 1978	
Indonesia	3 Sep 1976	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	18 Dec 2001	
Iraq	25 Sep 1978	
Ireland	16 Dec 1980	
Israel	1 Feb 1974	
Italy	14 Apr 1975	
Jamaica	6 Oct 1989	
Japan	27 Sep 1973	
Jordan	28 Feb 1973	
Kazakhstan	29 Apr 1997	

Participant	*Participation in the Convention by virtue of ratification, accession or succession to the Protocol of 25 March 1972 or to the 1961 Convention after the entry into force of the Protocol*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Kenya	9 Feb 1973	
Kuwait	7 Nov 1973	
Kyrgyzstan	7 Oct 1994	
Lao People's Democratic Republic	16 Mar 2009	
Latvia	16 Jul 1993	
Lebanon	5 Mar 1997	
Lesotho	4 Nov 1974	
Liberia		13 Apr 1987
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	27 Sep 1978	
Liechtenstein	24 Nov 1999	
Lithuania	28 Feb 1994	
Luxembourg	13 Oct 1976	
Madagascar	20 Jun 1974	
Malawi	4 Oct 1973	
Malaysia	20 Apr 1978	
Maldives		7 Sep 2000 a
Mali	31 Oct 1995	
Malta		22 Feb 1990 a
Marshall Islands	9 Aug 1991	
Mauritania		24 Oct 1989 a
Mauritius	12 Dec 1994	
Mexico	27 Apr 1977	
Micronesia (Federated States of)	29 May 1991	
Monaco	30 Dec 1975	
Mongolia	6 May 1991	
Montenegro[6]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	19 Mar 2002	
Mozambique	8 Jun 1998	
Myanmar	22 Aug 2003	
Namibia		31 Mar 1998 a
Nepal		29 Jun 1987 a
Netherlands	29 May 1987	
New Zealand[7]	7 Jun 1990	

Participant	Participation in the Convention by virtue of ratification, accession or succession to the Protocol of 25 March 1972 or to the 1961 Convention after the entry into force of the Protocol	Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)
Nicaragua	15 Feb 2005	
Niger	28 Dec 1973	
Nigeria		24 Jun 1981 a
Norway	12 Nov 1973	
Oman	24 Jul 1987	
Pakistan	2 Jul 1999	
Palau		19 Aug 1998 a
Panama	19 Oct 1972	
Papua New Guinea	28 Oct 1980	
Paraguay	20 Jun 1973	
Peru	12 Sep 1977	
Philippines	7 Jun 1974	
Poland	9 Jun 1993	
Portugal[2]	20 Apr 1979	
Qatar		3 Oct 1986 a
Republic of Korea	25 Jan 1973	
Republic of Moldova	15 Feb 1995	
Romania	14 Jan 1974	
Russian Federation	3 Jun 1996	
Rwanda		15 Jul 1981 a
San Marino	10 Oct 2000	
Sao Tome and Principe	20 Jun 1996	
Saudi Arabia		7 Nov 1997 a
Senegal	25 Mar 1974	
Serbia[1]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles	27 Feb 1992	
Sierra Leone		6 Jun 1994 a
Singapore	9 Jul 1975	
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[1]		6 Jul 1992 d
Solomon Islands	17 Mar 1982	
Somalia	9 Jun 1988	
South Africa	16 Dec 1975	
Spain	4 Jan 1977	
Sri Lanka	29 Jun 1981	
St. Kitts and Nevis	9 May 1994	
St. Lucia	5 Jul 1991	
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	3 Dec 2001	
Sudan	5 Jul 1994	
Suriname	29 Mar 1990	
Swaziland		18 Oct 1995 a
Sweden	5 Dec 1972	
Switzerland	22 Apr 1996	
Syrian Arab Republic	1 Feb 1974	
Tajikistan		26 Mar 1997 a
Thailand	9 Jan 1975	
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	13 Oct 1993	
Togo	10 Nov 1976	
Tonga	5 Sep 1973	
Trinidad and Tobago	23 Jul 1979	
Tunisia	29 Jun 1976	
Turkey	20 Jul 2001	
Turkmenistan	21 Feb 1996	
Uganda	15 Apr 1988	
Ukraine	27 Sep 2001	
United Arab Emirates		17 Feb 1988 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[3]	20 Jun 1978	
United Republic of Tanzania		25 Mar 1999 a
United States of America	1 Nov 1972	
Uruguay	31 Oct 1975	
Uzbekistan		24 Aug 1995 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	4 Dec 1985	
Viet Nam		4 Nov 1997 a
Yemen		25 Mar 1996 a
Zambia	13 May 1998	
Zimbabwe		30 Jul 1993 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ANDORRA

Reservation:

The Principality of Andorra does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 2 of article 48 which provide for a mandatory referral to the International Court of Justice of any dispute which cannot be resolved according to the terms of paragraph 1. The Government of Andorra takes the position that for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision the agreement of all the parties to the dispute shall be necessary in each individual case.

BAHRAIN

Reservation:

With regard to article 48, paragraph 2:

[See chapter VI.16 for the text of the reservation.]

Declaration:

[See chapter VI.16 for the text of the declaration and the objection thereto.]

CHINA

[See chapter VI.16.]

NEPAL

"His Majesty's Government of Nepal in accordance with article 49 paragraph 1 of the said Convention hereby reserves the right to permit temporarily in its territory:

i. the quasi-medical use of opium;

ii. The use of cannabis, cannabis resin, extracts and tinctures of cannabis for non-medical purposes; and

iii. The production and manufacture of and trade in the drugs referred to under (i) and (ii) above."

SAUDI ARABIA

Reservation:

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia will not be bound by article 48, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

VIET NAM[8]

Reservation:

[The Government of Viet Nam declares its reservation to] article 36, paragraph 2, point b on Extradition and article 48, paragraph 2 on Dispute settlement.

[See also text of the declarations and reservations made in respect of the unamended Convention (chapter VI.15) and of the amending Protocol of 25 March 1972 (chapter VI.17).

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were received upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRIA

16 December 1998

With regard to the reservation made by Viet Nam upon accession:

"Austria is of the view that the reservation raises doubts as to its compatibility with the object and purpose of the Convention concerned, in particular the fundamental principle that perpetrators of drug-related crime should be brought to justice, regardless of their whereabouts. Non-acceptance of this principle would undermine the effectiveness of the above-mentioned Convention.

Austria therefore objects to the reservation. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the above-mentioned Convention between Austria and Viet Nam."

SWEDEN

14 December 1998

With regard to the reservation made by Viet Nam upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden is of the view that the reservation made by the Government of Viet Nam regarding article 36, paragraph 2 subparagraph (b) may raise doubts as to the commitment of Viet Nam to the object and purpose of the Convention.

...

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

Furthermore, according to the Vienna Convention on the law of Treaties of 23 May 1969, and well-established customary international law, a reservation contrary to the object and purpose of the treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid [reservation] by the Government of Viet Nam.

[This objection does] not preclude the entry into force of the [Convention] between Viet Nam and Sweden. The [Convention] will thus become operative berween the two States without Viet Nam benefiting from the [reservation]."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

17 December 1998

With regard to the reservation to article 36 (2)(b) made by Viet Nam upon accession:

"The United Kingdom is not in a position to accept [the] reservation."

The above objection is not however to constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the said [Convention] as between Vietnam and the United Kingdom."

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia had ratified the Protocol on 23 June 1978. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] On 9 and 15 December 1999, the Secretary-General received communications regarding the status of Macao from China and Portugal (see also note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portugal" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[3] The Secretary-General received communications regarding the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention and Protocol will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

In addition, the notification made by China contained the following declaration:

The reservation to paragraph 2, article 48 of the said Convention made by the Government of the People's Republic of China will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

[4] Czechoslovakia, by virtue of its accession on 4 June 1991 to the Protocol of 25 March 1972 amending the Single Convention, became as of the date of its accession a participant in the Convention. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] The German Democratic Republic, by virtue of its accession on 4 October 1988 to the Protocol of 25 March 1972 amending the Single Convention, became as of the date of its accession a participant in the Convention. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] Applicable to Niue and Tokelau. See also note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] In a communication received on 15 January 1999, the Government of Finland notified the Secretary-General of the following:

"The Government of Finland is of the view that [this reservation] raise[s] doubts as to [its] compatibility with the object and purpose of the [Convenion] concerned, in particular the [reservation] to article 32, paragraph 2, subparagraph b) 1). According to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, and well-established customary international law, a reservation contrary to the object and purpose of the treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become Parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all Parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to [this reservation] made by the Government of Viet Nam to the [Convention].

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the [Convention] between Viet Nam and Finland. The [Convention] will thus become operative between the two States without Viet Nam benefitting from [this reservation]."

19. UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION AGAINST ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN NARCOTIC DRUGS AND PSYCHOTROPIC SUBSTANCES

Vienna, 20 December 1988

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 11 November 1990, in accordance with article 29(1).
REGISTRATION: 11 November 1990, No. 27627.
STATUS: Signatories: 87. Parties: 184.
TEXT: Document of the United Nations Economic and Social Council E/CONF.82/15, Corr.1 and Corr.2 (English only); and depositary notification C.N.31.1990.TREATIES-1 of 9 April 1990 (procès-verbal of rectification of original French and Spanish texts); C.N.229.2007.TREATIES-1 of 12 March 2007 (Notification under article 12 (2) of the Convention).

Note: The Convention was adopted by the United Nations Conference for the Adoption of a Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, held at Vienna from 25 November to 20 December 1988. The Conference was convened pursuant to resolution 1988/8 of 25 May 1988 of the Economic and Social Council acting on the basis of the General Assembly resolutions 39/141 of 14 December 1984 and 42/111 of 7 December 1987. The Convention was open for signature at the United Nations Office at Vienna, from 20 December 1988 to 28 February 1989, and thereafter at the Headquarters of the United Nations at New York, until 20 December 1989. In addition to the Convention, the Conference adopted the Final Act and certain resolutions which are annexed to the Final Act. The text of the Final Act was published in document E/CONF.82/14.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Acceptance(A), Approval(AA), Formal confirmation(c), Succession(d)*
Afghanistan	20 Dec 1988	14 Feb 1992
Albania		27 Jun 2001 a
Algeria	20 Dec 1988	9 May 1995
Andorra		23 Jul 1999 a
Angola		26 Oct 2005 a
Antigua and Barbuda		5 Apr 1993 a
Argentina	20 Dec 1988	28 Jun 1993
Armenia		13 Sep 1993 a
Australia	14 Feb 1989	16 Nov 1992
Austria	25 Sep 1989	11 Jul 1997
Azerbaijan		22 Sep 1993 a
Bahamas	20 Dec 1988	30 Jan 1989
Bahrain	28 Sep 1989	7 Feb 1990
Bangladesh	14 Apr 1989	11 Oct 1990
Barbados		15 Oct 1992 a
Belarus	27 Feb 1989	15 Oct 1990
Belgium	22 May 1989	25 Oct 1995
Belize		24 Jul 1996 a
Benin		23 May 1997 a
Bhutan		27 Aug 1990 a
Bolivia	20 Dec 1988	20 Aug 1990
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1]		1 Sep 1993 d
Botswana		13 Aug 1996 a
Brazil	20 Dec 1988	17 Jul 1991
Brunei Darussalam	26 Oct 1989	12 Nov 1993
Bulgaria	19 May 1989	24 Sep 1992
Burkina Faso		2 Jun 1992 a
Burundi		18 Feb 1993 a
Cambodia		7 Jul 2005 a
Cameroon	27 Feb 1989	28 Oct 1991
Canada	20 Dec 1988	5 Jul 1990
Cape Verde		8 May 1995 a
Central African Republic		15 Oct 2001 a
Chad		9 Jun 1995 a
Chile	20 Dec 1988	13 Mar 1990
China[2,3]	20 Dec 1988	25 Oct 1989
Colombia	20 Dec 1988	10 Jun 1994
Comoros		1 Mar 2000 a
Congo		3 Mar 2004 a
Cook Islands		22 Feb 2005 a
Costa Rica	25 Apr 1989	8 Feb 1991
Côte d'Ivoire	20 Dec 1988	25 Nov 1991
Croatia[1]		26 Jul 1993 d
Cuba	7 Apr 1989	12 Jun 1996

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Acceptance(A), Approval(AA), Formal confirmation(c), Succession(d)*
Cyprus	20 Dec 1988	25 May 1990
Czech Republic[4]		30 Dec 1993 d
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		19 Mar 2007 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo	20 Dec 1988	28 Oct 2005
Denmark	20 Dec 1988	19 Dec 1991
Djibouti		22 Feb 2001 a
Dominica		30 Jun 1993 a
Dominican Republic		21 Sep 1993 a
Ecuador	21 Jun 1989	23 Mar 1990
Egypt	20 Dec 1988	15 Mar 1991
El Salvador		21 May 1993 a
Eritrea		30 Jan 2002 a
Estonia		12 Jul 2000 a
Ethiopia		11 Oct 1994 a
European Community	8 Jun 1989	31 Dec 1990 c
Fiji		25 Mar 1993 a
Finland	8 Feb 1989	15 Feb 1994 A
France	13 Feb 1989	31 Dec 1990 AA
Gabon	20 Dec 1989	10 Jul 2006
Gambia		23 Apr 1996 a
Georgia		8 Jan 1998 a
Germany[5]	19 Jan 1989	30 Nov 1993
Ghana	20 Dec 1988	10 Apr 1990
Greece	23 Feb 1989	28 Jan 1992
Grenada		10 Dec 1990 a
Guatemala	20 Dec 1988	28 Feb 1991
Guinea		27 Dec 1990 a
Guinea-Bissau		27 Oct 1995 a
Guyana		19 Mar 1993 a
Haiti		18 Sep 1995 a
Holy See	20 Dec 1988	
Honduras	20 Dec 1988	11 Dec 1991
Hungary	22 Aug 1989	15 Nov 1996
Iceland		2 Sep 1997 a
India		27 Mar 1990 a
Indonesia	27 Mar 1989	23 Feb 1999
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	20 Dec 1988	7 Dec 1992
Iraq		22 Jul 1998 a
Ireland	14 Dec 1989	3 Sep 1996
Israel	20 Dec 1988	20 Mar 2002
Italy	20 Dec 1988	31 Dec 1990 AA
Jamaica	2 Oct 1989	29 Dec 1995
Japan	19 Dec 1989	12 Jun 1992
Jordan	20 Dec 1988	16 Apr 1990
Kazakhstan		29 Apr 1997 a
Kenya		19 Oct 1992 a
Kuwait	2 Oct 1989	3 Nov 2000
Kyrgyzstan		7 Oct 1994 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		1 Oct 2004 a
Latvia		24 Feb 1994 a
Lebanon		11 Mar 1996 a
Lesotho		28 Mar 1995 a
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		22 Jul 1996 a
Liechtenstein		9 Mar 2007 a
Lithuania		8 Jun 1998 a
Luxembourg	26 Sep 1989	29 Apr 1992
Madagascar		12 Mar 1991 a
Malawi		12 Oct 1995 a
Malaysia	20 Dec 1988	11 May 1993
Maldives	5 Dec 1989	7 Sep 2000
Mali		31 Oct 1995 a
Malta		28 Feb 1996 a
Mauritania	20 Dec 1988	1 Jul 1993
Mauritius	20 Dec 1988	6 Mar 2001
Mexico	16 Feb 1989	11 Apr 1990
Micronesia (Federated States of)		6 Jul 2004 a
Monaco	24 Feb 1989	23 Apr 1991
Mongolia		25 Jun 2003 a
Montenegro[6]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	28 Dec 1988	28 Oct 1992
Mozambique		8 Jun 1998 a
Myanmar		11 Jun 1991 a
Namibia		6 Mar 2009 a
Nepal		24 Jul 1991 a
Netherlands[7]	18 Jan 1989	8 Sep 1993 A
New Zealand[8]	18 Dec 1989	16 Dec 1998

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Acceptance(A), Approval(AA), Formal confirmation(c), Succession(d)*
Nicaragua	20 Dec 1988	4 May 1990
Niger		10 Nov 1992 a
Nigeria	1 Mar 1989	1 Nov 1989
Norway	20 Dec 1988	14 Nov 1994
Oman		15 Mar 1991 a
Pakistan	20 Dec 1989	25 Oct 1991
Panama	20 Dec 1988	13 Jan 1994
Paraguay	20 Dec 1988	23 Aug 1990
Peru	20 Dec 1988	16 Jan 1992
Philippines	20 Dec 1988	7 Jun 1996
Poland	6 Mar 1989	26 May 1994
Portugal[2]	13 Dec 1989	3 Dec 1991
Qatar		4 May 1990 a
Republic of Korea		28 Dec 1998 a
Republic of Moldova		15 Feb 1995 a
Romania		21 Jan 1993 a
Russian Federation	19 Jan 1989	17 Dec 1990
Rwanda		13 May 2002 a
Samoa		19 Aug 2005 a
San Marino		10 Oct 2000 a
Sao Tome and Principe		20 Jun 1996 a
Saudi Arabia		9 Jan 1992 a
Senegal	20 Dec 1988	27 Nov 1989
Serbia[1]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		27 Feb 1992 a
Sierra Leone	9 Jun 1989	6 Jun 1994
Singapore		23 Oct 1997 a
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[1]		6 Jul 1992 d
South Africa		14 Dec 1998 a
Spain	20 Dec 1988	13 Aug 1990
Sri Lanka		6 Jun 1991 a
St. Kitts and Nevis		19 Apr 1995 a
St. Lucia		21 Aug 1995 a
St. Vincent and the Grenadines		17 May 1994 a
Sudan	30 Jan 1989	19 Nov 1993
Suriname	20 Dec 1988	28 Oct 1992
Swaziland		3 Oct 1995 a
Sweden	20 Dec 1988	22 Jul 1991
Switzerland	16 Nov 1989	14 Sep 2005
Syrian Arab Republic		3 Sep 1991 a
Tajikistan		6 May 1996 a
Thailand		3 May 2002 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		13 Oct 1993 a
Togo	3 Aug 1989	1 Aug 1990
Tonga		29 Apr 1996 a
Trinidad and Tobago	7 Dec 1989	17 Feb 1995
Tunisia	19 Dec 1989	20 Sep 1990
Turkey	20 Dec 1988	2 Apr 1996
Turkmenistan		21 Feb 1996 a
Uganda		20 Aug 1990 a
Ukraine	16 Mar 1989	28 Aug 1991
United Arab Emirates		12 Apr 1990 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[3,9]	20 Dec 1988	28 Jun 1991
United Republic of Tanzania	20 Dec 1988	17 Apr 1996
United States of America	20 Dec 1988	20 Feb 1990
Uruguay	19 Dec 1989	10 Mar 1995
Uzbekistan		24 Aug 1995 a
Vanuatu		26 Jan 2006 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	20 Dec 1988	16 Jul 1991
Viet Nam		4 Nov 1997 a
Yemen[10]	20 Dec 1988	25 Mar 1996
Zambia	9 Feb 1989	28 May 1993
Zimbabwe		30 Jul 1993 a

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance, approval, formal confirmation or succession.)

ALGERIA

Reservation:

The People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 32, paragraph 2, the compulsory referral of any dispute of the International Court of Justice.

The People's Democratic Republic of Algeria declares that for a dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice the agreement of all the parties to the dispute is necessary in each case.

ANDORRA

Reservation:

With respect to the option provided in paragraph 4 of article 32, the Andorran State does consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraphs 2 and 3 of this article.

With respect to paragraph 2, the Andorran State considers that any dispute which cannot be settled in the manner prescribed in paragraph 1 of the aforementioned article will be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the agreement of all parties involved in the dispute.

Declaration:

Since the Andorran legal system already embodies almost all the measures referred to in the Vienna Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, accession to the aforementioned Convention will entail only minor changes in the Andorran State's legal system, which will be taken into account in the future legislative activity. From the point of view of the rights and obligations arising from accession to this Convention, without renouncing the specific characteristics of its domestic legislation, in particular with respect to the protection of individual freedoms and the rights of bona fide third parties, and to the preservation of national sovereignty and the common good, Andorra undertakes to assume the obligations among States arising from the Vienna Convention and to cooperate, through its judicial authorities and on the basis of reciprocity, with the other States which have accepted the provisions of the aforementioned Convention.

AUSTRIA

Declarations:

"re. Art. 2:

The Republic of Austria interprets the reference to the fundamental provisions of domestic legislative systems in art. 2 para 1 in the sense that the contents of these fundamental provisions may be subject to change. The same applies to all other references of the Convention to domestic law, its fundamental principles or the national constitutional order like they are contained in art. 3 para 1 lit.c; para 2, para 10 and para 11; art. 5 para 4 lit.c; para 7 and para 9 or art. 11 para 1.

re. Art. 3:

The Republic of Austria interprets art. 3 para 1 and 2 as follows: In cases of a minor nature, the obligations contained in this provision may also be implemented by the creation of administrative penal regulations providing adequate sanction for the offences enumerated therein.

re. Art. 7 para 10 to 12 :

The Republic of Austria declares that in pursuance of its domestic law, a request for the search of persons or rooms, for the seizure of objects or for the surveillance of telecommunication requires the enclosure of the certified copy or photocopy of the decision of the competent authority. If the decision has not been rendered by a court, a declaration of the authority requesting legal assistance has to be furnished, stating that all necessary preconditions are fulfilled, according to the law of the requesting state."

BAHRAIN[11]

Reservation:

The State of Bahrain, by the ratification of this Convention, does not consider itself bound by paragraph (2) of article 32 in connection with the obligation to refer the settlement of the dispute relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention to the International Court of Justice.

Declaration:

Moreover, the State of Bahrain hereby declares that its ratification of this Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith.

BELIZE

Reservation:

"Article 8 of the Convention requires the Parties to give consideration to the possibility of transferring to one another proceedings for criminal prosecution of certain offences where such transfer is considered to be in the interests of a proper administration of justice.

"The courts of Belize have no extra-territorial jurisdiction, with the result that they will have no jurisdiction to prosecute offences committed abroad unless such offences are committed partly within and partly without the jurisdiction, by a person who is within the jurisdiction. Moreover, under the Constitution of Belize, the control of public prosecutions is vested in the Director of Public Prosecutions, who is an independent functionary and not under Government control.

"Accordingly, Belize will be able to implement article 8 of the Convention only to a limited extent insofar as its Constitution and the law allows."

BOLIVIA

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Republic of Bolivia places on record its express reservation to article 3, paragraph 2, and declares the inapplicability to Bolivia of those provisions of that paragraph which could be interpreted as establishing as a criminal offence the use, consumption, possession, purchase or cultivation of the coca leaf for personal consumption.

For Bolivia such an interpretation of that paragraph is contrary to principles of its Constitution and basic concepts of its legal system which embody respect for the culture, legitimate practices, values and attributes of the nationalities making up Bolivia's population.

Bolivia's legal system recognizes the ancestral nature of the licit use of the coca leaf which, for much of Bolivia's population, dates back over centuries. In formulating this reservation, Bolivia considers that:

- The coca leaf is not, in and of itself, a narcotic drug or psychotropic substance;
- The use and consumption of the coca leaf do not cause psychological or physical changes greater than those resulting from the consumption of other plants and products which are in free and universal use;
- The coca leaf is widely used for medicinal purposes in the practice of traditional medicine, the validity of which is upheld by WHO and confirmed by scientific findings;
- The coca leaf can be used for industrial purposes;
- The coca leaf is widely used and consumed in Bolivia, with the result that, if such an interpretation of the above-mentioned paragraph was accepted, a large part of Bolivia's population could be

considered criminals and punished as such, such an interpretation is therefore inapplicable;

- It must be placed on record that the coca leaf is transformed into cocaine paste, sulphate and hydrochlorate when it is subjected to chemical processes which involve the use of precursors, equipment and materials which are neither manufactured in or originate in Bolivia.

At the same time, the Republic of Bolivia will continue to take all necessary legal measures to control the illicit cultivation of coca for the production of narcotic drugs, as well as the illicit consumption, use and purchase of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances.

BRAZIL

Upon signature:

"a) The signature of the Convention is made subject to the process of ratification established by the Brazilian Constitution;

" b) It is the understanding of the Brazilian Government that paragraph 11 of article 17 does not prevent a coastal State from requiring prior authorization for any action under this article by other States in its Exclusive Economic Zone."

BRUNEI DARUSSALAM

19 June 2007

"The competent authority under article 7 (8) is the following:

Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Jalan Subok
Bandar Seri Begawan BD, 2710, Brunei Darussalam
Telephone: (673) 226 1177; Fax: (673) 226 1709;
Email: mfa@gov.bn

Reservation:

"In accordance with article 32 of the Convention Brunei Darussalam hereby declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraphs 2 and 3 of the said article 32."

CHINA

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

Under the Article 32, paragraph 4, China does not consider itself bound by paragraphs 2 and 3 of that article.

COLOMBIA[12]

Upon signature:

Colombia formulates a reservation to article 9, paragraph 1, of the Convention, specifically subparagraphs (b), (c), (d) and (e) thereof, since its legislation does not permit outside co-operation with the judiciary in investigating offences nor the establishment of joint teams with other countries to that end. Likewise inasmuch as samples of the substances that have given rise to investigations belong to the proceedings, only the judge, as previously, can take decisions in that regard.

Upon ratification:

Reservations:

...

2. With respect to article 5, paragraph 7, of the Convention, Colombia does not consider itself bound to reverse the onus of proof.

3. Colombia has reservations in connection with article 9, paragraphs 1 (b), (c), (d) and (e), inasmuch as they conflict with the autonomy and independence of the judicial authorities in their jurisdiction over the investigation and judgement of offences.

Declarations:

1. No provision of the Convention may be interpreted as obliging Colombia to adopt legislative, judicial, administrative or other measures that might impair or restrict its constitutional or legal system or that go beyond the terms of the treaties to which the Colombian State is a contracting party.

2. It is the view of Colombia that treatment under the Convention of the cultivation of the coca leaf as a criminal offence must be harmonized with a policy of alternative development, taking into account the rights of the indigenous communities involved and the protection of the environment. In this connection it is the view of Colombia that the discriminatory, inequitable and restrictive treatment accorded its agricultural export products on international markets does nothing to contribute to the control of illicit crops, but, rather, is a cause of social and environmental degradation in the areas affected. Further, Colombia reserves the right to make an independent evaluation of the ecological impact of drug control policies, since those that have a negative impact on ecosystems contravene the Constitution.

3. It is the understanding of Colombia that article 3, paragraph 7, of the Convention will be applied in accordance with its penal system, taking into account the benefits of its policies regarding the indictment of and collaboration with alleged criminals.

4. A request for reciprocal legal assistance will not be met when the Colombian judicial and other authorities consider that to do so would run counter to the public interest or the constitutional or legal order. The principle of reciprocity must also be observed.

5. It is the understanding of Colombia that article 3, paragraph 8, of the Convention does not imply the non-applicability of the statutory limitation of penal action.

6. Article 24 of the Convention, on "more strict or severe measures", may not be interpreted as conferring on the Government powers that are broader than those conferred by the Political Constitution of Colombia, including in states of exception.

7. It is the understanding of Colombia that the assistance provided for under article 17 of the Convention will be effective only on the high seas and at the express request and with the authorization of the Colombian Government.

8. Colombia declares that it considers contrary to the principles and norms of international law, in particular those of sovereign equality, territorial integrity and non-intervention, any attempt to abduct or illegally deprive of freedom any person within the territory of one State for the purpose of bringing that person before the courts of another State.

9. It is the understanding of Colombia that the transfer of proceedings referred to in article 8 of the Convention will take place in such a way as not to impair the constitutional guarantees of the right of defence. Further, Colombia declares with respect to article 6, paragraph 10, of the Convention that, in the execution offoreign sentences, the provisions of article 35, paragraph 2, of its Political Constitution and other legal and constitutional norms must be observed

The international obligations deriving from article 3, paragraphs 1 (c) and 2, as well as from article 11 are conditional on respect for Colombian constitutional principles and the above three reservations and nine declarations making the Convention compatible with the Colombian constitutional order.

CUBA

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 32, paragraphs 2 and 3, and that disputes which arise between the Parties should be settled by negotiation through the diplomatic channel.

CYPRUS

Upon signature:

"[Signature is effected] subject to ratification, at the time of which reservations in respect of specific provisions of the Convention may be made and deposited in the prescribed manner. [It is understood] that such reservations, if any, cannot be incompatible with the object and purpose of this Convention."

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

"As a result of the occupation of 37% of the territory of the Republic of Cyprus, which since 1974 is occupied by Turkish troops in violation of the United Nations Charter and of basic principles of international law, the Government of the Republic of Cyprus is prevented from exercising its legitimate control and jurisdiction throughout the territory of the Republic of Cyprus and consequently over those activities in the illegally occupied area which are related to illicit drug trafficking."

DENMARK

Declarations:

"The Convention shall not apply to the Faroe Islands and Greenland."

With regard to article 17:

"Authorization granted by Danish authority pursuant to article 17 denotes only that Denmark will abstain from pleading infringement of Danish sovereignty in connection with the requesting State's boarding of a vessel. Danish authorities cannot authorize another State to take legal action on behalf of the Kingdom of Denmark."

FRANCE

Reservations:

The Government of the French Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 32, paragraph 2, and declares that any dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention which cannot be settled in the manner prescribed in paragraph 1 of the said article may not be referred to the International Court of Justice unless all the parties to the dispute agree thereto.

Similarly, the Government of the French Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 32, paragraph 3.

GERMANY[5]

Declaration:

It is the understanding of the Federal Republic of Germany that the basic concepts of the legal system referred to in article 3, paragraph 2 of the Convention may be subject to change.

INDONESIA

Reservation:

"The Republic of Indonesia [...] does not consider itself bound by the provision of article 32 paragraphs (2) and (3), and take the position that disputes relating to the interpretation and application [of] the Convention which have not been settled through the channel provided for in paragraph (1) of the said article, may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of the Parties to the dispute."

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Upon signature:

"The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran wishes to express reservation to article 6, paragraph 3, of the Convention, since this provision is incompatible with our domestic law.

"The Government furthermore wishes to make a reservation to article 32, paragraphs 2 and 3, since it does not consider itself bound to compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and feels that any disputes arising between the Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention should be resolved through direct negotiations by diplomatic means."

IRELAND

1 February 2006

"... the authority now designated by Ireland under Article 17 (7) of the Convention is as follows:

Head of Unit
Liaison & Joint Operations
Customs Drugs Law Enforcement
Revenue Investigations & Prosecutions Division
Ashtown Gate
Dublin 15
Ireland
Telephone No. (office hours):
+ 353 1 827 7512
24 hour Telephone No. (outside office hours):
+ 353 87 254 8201 Fax: + 353 1 827 7680
E-mail address: antidrugs@revenue.ie
Office Hours : 0800 - 1800 (Monday-Friday)
Languages of incoming requests accepted: English
Time zone: GMT:+/-:0"

ISRAEL

Declaration:

"In accordance with paragraph 4 of Article 32, the Government of the State of Israel declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 2 of and 3 of this Article."

JAMAICA[13]

KUWAIT

Reservation:

With reservation as to paragraphs (2) and (3) of article 32 of this Convention.

LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Reservation:

"In accordance with paragraph 4, Article 32 of the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, the Lao People's Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2, Article 32 of the present Convention. The Lao People's Democratic Republic declares that to refer a dispute relating to interpretation and application of the present Convention to arbitration or the International Court of Justice, the agreement of all parties concerned in the dispute is necessary."

LEBANON[14]

Reservations:

1. The Government of the Lebanese Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions

of article 32, paragraph 2, and declares that disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention which are not settled by the means prescribed in paragraph 1 of that article shall be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the agreement of all of the Parties to the dispute.

Similarly, the Government of the Lebanese Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 32, paragraph 3.

2. The Government of the Lebanese Republic has reservations regarding article 5, paragraph 3, regarding article 7, paragraph 2 (f), and regarding article 7, paragraph 5, of the Convention.

LITHUANIA

Declaration:

“In accordance with article 6 of the said Convention the Republic of Lithuania declares that this Convention shall not be the legal basis for extradition of the Lithuanian citizens as it is provided in the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania.”

Reservation:

In accordance with paragraph 4 of article 32 of the said Convention the Republic of Lithuania will not apply provisions of paragraph 2 and 3 of article 32, referring to the disputes relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention to the International Court of Justice.”

MALAYSIA

Declaration:

"The Government of Malaysia does not consider itself bound by paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 32 of the said Convention, wherein if there should arise between two or more Parties a dispute and such dispute cannot be settled in the manner prescribed in paragraph 1 of article 32 of the Convention, Malaysia is not bound to refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice for decision.”

MYANMAR

Reservations:

"The Government of the Union of Myanmar wishes to express reservation on article 6 relating to extradition and does not consider itself bound by the same in so far as its own Myanmar nationals are concerned.

"The Government further wishes to make a reservation on article 32, paragraphs 2 and 3 and does not consider itself bound by obligations to refer the disputes relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention to the International Court of Justice."

NETHERLANDS

Upon signature:

Understanding:

"1 . Article 1 - Definition of Illicit Traffic

During the initial stages of this Conference, [the Government of the Netherlands] proposed to amend articles 15, 17, 18 and 19 (final numbering) in order to replace the generic phrase ‘illicit traffic’ by more specific language (e.g., ‘illicit transport’).

"To some extent the underlying concerns have been met by the introduction in Article 15 of a specific reference to the ‘offences established in accordance with Article 3, paragraph 2’. On the other hand, articles 17, 18 and 19 still contain references to ‘illicit traffic in narcotic drugs, psychotropic substances and substances in table I and table II’.

"It is the understanding [of the Government of the Netherlands] that, given the scope of these articles, the term ‘illicit traffic’ has to be understood in a limited sense, in each case taking into account the specific context. In applying these articles, [it] would therefore have to rely on the chapeau of article 1, allowing for a contextual application of the relevant definition.

“2. Article 3

“(a). [The Government of the Netherlands] notes with respect to article 3, paragraph 2 (subparagraph (b) (i) and (ii), and subparagraph (c) (i)) that the Drafting Committee has replaced the terms `knowing that such property is derived from an offence or offences set forth in paragraph 2' by: ‘knowing that such property is derived from an offence or offences *established in accordance with paragraph 1’* . [The Government of the Netherlands] accepts this change with the understanding that this does not affect the applicability of the paragraphs referred to in cases where the offender knows that property is derived from an offence or offences that may have been established and committed under the jurisdiction of a foreign State.

"(b). With respect of article 3, paragraph 6, [the Government of the Nethesions cover offences established both under paragraph 1 and paragraph 2. In view of the provisions of paragraph 4 (d) and paragraph 11 of the same article, [the Government of the Netherlands] understands that the measure of discretionary legal powers relating to the prosecution for offences established in accordance with paragraph 2 may in practice be wider than for offences established in accordance with paragraph 1.

"(c). With respect to article 3, paragraphs 7 and 8, it is the understanding of [the Government of the Netherlands] that these provisions do not require the establishment of specific rules and regulations on the early release of convicted persons and the statute of limitations in respect of offences, covered by paragraph 1 of the article, which are different from such rules and regulations in respect of other, equally serious, offences. Consequently, it is [the Government's] understanding that the relevant legislation presently in force within the Kingdom sufficiently and appropriately meets the concerns expressed by the terms of these provisions.

"Article 17

[The Government of the Netherlands] understands the reference (in para.3) to ‘a vessel exercising freedom of navigation’ to mean a vessel navigating beyond the external limits of the territorial sea.

"The safeguard-clause contained in para. 11 of the article aims in [its] view at safeguarding the rights and obligations of Coastal States within the contiguous zone.

"To the extent that vessels navigating in the contiguous zone act in infringement of the Coastal State's customs and other regulations, the Coastal State is entitled to exercise, in conformity with the relevant rules of the international law of the sea, jurisdiction to prevent and/or punish such infringement."

Upon acceptance:

Reservation:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the provisions of article 3, paragraphs 6, 7, and 8, only in so far as the obligations undeese provisions are in accordance with Dutch criminal legislation and Dutch policy on criminal matters.”

PANAMA

Reservation:

The Republic of Panama does not consider itself obligated to apply the measures of confiscation or seizure provided for in article 5, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Convention to property the value of which corresponds to that of the proceeds derived from offences established in accordance with the said Convention, in so far as such measures would contravene the provisions of article 30 of the Constitution of Panama, under which there is no penalty of confiscation of property.

PERU

Upon signature:

Peru formulates an express reservation to paragraph 1 (a) (ii) of article 3, concerning offences and sanctions; that paragraph includes cultivation among the activities established as criminal offences, without drawing the necessary clear distinction between licit and illicit cultivation. Accordingly, Peru also formulates an express reservation to the scope of the definition of illicit traffic contained in article 1 in so far as it refers to article 3, paragraph 1 (a) (ii).

In accordance with the provisions of article 32, paragraph 4, Peru declares, on signing the Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, that it does not consider itself bound by article 32, paragraphs 2 and 3, since, in respect of this Convention, it agrees to the referral of disputes to the International Court of Justice only if all the parties, and not just one, agree to such a procedure.

PHILIPPINES[15]

SAN MARINO

Declaration:

"[The Republic of San Marino declares] that any confiscation activity under article 5 is subject to the fact that the crime is considered as such also by San Marino legal system.

Moreover, it declares that the establishment of "joint teams" and "liaison officers", under article 9, item 1, letter c) and d), as well as "controlled delivery" under article 11 of the [...] Convention, are not provided for by San Marino legal system."

SAUDI ARABIA[11]

Declarations:

1. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia does not regard itself bound by article 32, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Convention;
2. This ratification does not constitute recognition of Israel and shall not give rise to entry with it into any dealings or to the establishment with it of any relations under the Convention.

SINGAPORE

Declaration:

"With respect to article 6 paragraph 3, the Republic of Singapore declares that it shall not consider the Convention as the legal basis for extradition in respect of any offence to which article 6 applies."

Reservation:

"The Republic of Singapore declares, in pursuance of article 32, paragraph 4 of the Convention that it will not be bound by the provisions of article 32, paragraphs 2 and 3."

SOUTH AFRICA

Declaration

In keeping with paragraph 4 of article 32, the Republic of South Africa does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article 32 of the Convention.

SWEDEN

Declaration:

"Regarding article 3, paragraph 10, Swedish constitutional legislation on extradition implies that in judging whether a specific offence is to be regarded as a political offence, regard shall be paid to the circumstances in each individual case."

SWITZERLAND

Reservation concerning article 3, paragraph 2 :

Switzerland does not consider itself bound by article 3, paragraph 2, concerning the maintenance or adoption of criminal offences under legislation on narcotic drugs.

Reservation concerning article 3 , paragraphes 6, 7 and 8:

Switzerland considers the provisions of article 3, paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 as binding only to the extent that they are compatible with Swiss criminal legislation and Swiss policy on criminal matters.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC[11]

Declaration:

The accession to this Convention shall not constitute a recognition of Israel or lead to any kind of intercourse with it.

THAILAND

Reservation:

"The Government of the Kingdom of Thailand does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 32 of the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances."

TURKEY

Reservation:

Pursuant to paragraph 4 of article 32 of [said Convention], the Republic of Turkey is not bound by paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 32 of the Convention.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Reservation:

"The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland will only consider the granting of immunity under article 7, paragraph 18, where this is specifically requested by the person to whom the immunity would apply or by the authority designated, under article 7, paragraph 8, of the Party from whom assistance is requested. A request for immunity will not be granted where the judicial authorities of the United Kingdom consider that to do so would be contrary to the public interest."

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

Upon signature:

"Subject to a further determination on ratification, the United Republic of Tanzania declares that the provisions of article 17 paragraph 11 shall not be construed as either restraining in any manner the rights and privileges of a coastal State as envisaged by the relevant provisions relating to the Economic Exclusive Zone of the Law of the Sea Convention, or, as according third parties rights other than those so recognized under the Convention."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Understandings:

"(1) Nothing in this Treaty requires or authorizes legislation or other action by the United States of America prohibited by the Constitution of the United States.

"(2) The United States shall not consider this Convention as the legal basis for extradition of citizens to any country with which the United States has no bilateral extradition treaty in force.

"(3) Pursuant to the rights of the United States under article 7 of this treaty to deny requests which prejudice its essential interests, the United States shall deny a request for assistance when the designated authority, after consultation with all appropriate intelligence, anti-narcotic, and foreign policy agencies, has specific information that a senior government official who will have access to information to be provided under this treaty is engaged in or facilitates the production or distribution of illegal drugs."

Declaration:

"Pursuant to article 32 (4), the United States of America shall not be bound by article 32 (2)."

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Interpretative declarations:

1. With respect to article 6: (Extradition)

It is the understanding of the Government of Venezuela that this Convention shall not be considered a legal basis for the extradition of Venezuelan citizens, as provided for in the national legislation in force.

2. With respect to article 11: (Controlled Delivery)

It is the understanding of the Government of Venezuela that publicly actionable offences in the national territory shall be prosecuted by the competent national police authorities and that the controlled delivery procedure shall be applied only in so far as it does not contravene national legislation in this matter.

VIET NAM[16]

Reservations:

"Reservations to article 6 on Extradition, article 32 paragraph 2 and paragraph 3 on Dispute settlement."

YEMEN[10]

Upon signature:

[Yemen reserves its] right to enter reservations in respect of such articles as it may see fit at a time subsequent to this signature.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were received upon ratification, accession, acceptance, approval, formal confirmation or succession.)

AUSTRIA

16 December 1998

With regard to the reservation to article 6 made by Viet Nam upon accession:

"Austria is of the view that the reservation raises doubts as to its ratification of the mentioned treaty. Austria is of the view that the reservation raises doubts as to its compatibility with the object and purpose of the Convention concerned, in particular the fundamental principle that perpetrators of drug-related crime should be brought to justice, regardless of their whereabouts. Non-acceptance of this principle would undermine the effectiveness of the [said] Convention.

"Austria therefore objects to the reservation. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the [said] Convention between Austria and Vietnam."

BELGIUM

27 December 1989

Belgium, member State of the European Community, attached to the principle of freedom of navigation, notably in the exclusive economic zone, considers that the declaration of Brazil concerning paragraph 11 of article 17, of the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, adopted at Vienna on 20 December 1988, goes further than the rights accorded to coastal States by international law.

DENMARK

27 December 1989

[*Same objection* , mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium* .]

FINLAND

25 April 1997

With regard to the reservations made by Lebanon:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis *, as the one made by France.]*

FRANCE

27 December 1989

[*Same objection* , mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium* .]

7 March 1997

With regard to the reservations made by Lebanon upon accession:

The Government of France has taken note of the reservations [made] by the Government of Lebanon in respect of articles 5 and 7 of this Convention and considers these reservations to be contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Convention indicates that bank secrecy shall not be a ground for a failure to act or for a failure to render mutual assistance. The Government of France considers that these reservations therefore undermine the object and purpose of the Convention, as stated in article 2, paragraph 1, to promote cooperation in order to address more effectively the international dimension of illicit drugs trafficking.

16 December 1998

With regard to the reservation with regard to article 6 made by Viet Nam upon accession:

[The Government of France] considers [the reservation made by Viet Nam upon accession] to be contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention of 1988. France therefore objects to it.

The objection does not preclude the entry into force of the 1988 Convention between France and Viet Nam.

GERMANY[4]

27 December 1989

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis *, as the one made by Belgium.]*

21 March 1997

With regard to the reservations made by Lebanon:

[*Same objection* , mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by France* .]

16 December 1998

With regard to the reservation to article 6 made by Viet Nam upon accession:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers this reservation to be problematic in the light of the object and purpose of the Convention. The reservation made in respect of article 6 is contrary to the principle 'aut dedere au iudicare' which provides that offences are brought before the court or that extradition is granted to the requesting States.

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is therefore of the opinion that the reservation jeopardizes the intention of the Convention, as stated in article 2 paragraph 1, to promote cooperation among the parties so that they may address more effectively the international dimension of illicit drug trafficking.

"The reservation may also raise doubts as to the commitment of the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam to comply with fundamental provisions of the Convention. It is in the common interest of states that international treaties which they have concluded are respected, as to their object and purpose, and that all parties are prepared to undertake any legislative and administrative changes necessary to comply with their obligations.

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the reservation.

"This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam."

GREECE

27 December 1989

[*Same objection* , mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.*]

IRELAND

27 December 1989

[*Same objection* , mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium* .]

ITALY

27 December 1989

[*Same objection* , mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.*]

24 April 1997

With regard to the reservations made by Lebanon upon accession:

[*Same objection* , mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by France.*]

LUXEMBOURG

27 December 1989

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

MEXICO

10 July 1990

With regard to the interpretative declarations made by the United States of America:

The Government of the United Mexican States considers that the third declaration submitted by the Government of the United States of America (...) constitutes a unilateral claim to justification, not envisaged in the Convention, for denying legal assistance to a State that requests it, which runs counter to the purposes of the Convention. Consequently, the Government of the United Mexican States considers that such a declaration constitutes a reservation to which it objects.

This objection should not be interpreted as impeding the entry into force of the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988 as between the Government of the United Mexican States and the Government of the United States of America.

NETHERLANDS

27 December 1989

[*Same objection,* mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.*]

11 March 1997

With regard to the reservations made by Lebanon upon accession:

[*Same objection* , mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by France.*]

PORTUGAL

27 December 1989

[*Same objection,* mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.*]

SPAIN

27 December 1989

[*Same objection,* mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.*]

SWEDEN

7 March 1997

With regard to the reservations made by Lebanon upon accession:

[*Same objection* , mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by France.*]

14 December 1998

With regard to the reservation made by Viet Nam upon accession:

"... The Government of Sweden is of the view that the reservation made by the Government of Viet Nam regarding article 6, may raise doubts as to the commitment of Viet Nam to the object and purpose of the Convention.

"It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

"Furthermore, according to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969, and well-established customary international law, a reservation contrary to the object and purpose of the treaty shall not be permitted.

"The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid [reservation] by the Government of Viet Nam.

"[This objection does] not preclude the entry into force of the [Convention] between Viet Nam and Sweden. The [Convention] will thus become operative between the two States without Viet Nam benefiting from the [reservation]."

25 July 2001

With regard to the declaration made by San Marino upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the declaration made by San Marino at the time of its accession to the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, regarding articles 5, 9 and 11 of the Convention.

In this context, the Government of Sweden would like to recall that under well-established treaty law, the name assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified, does not determine itsreservation to the treaty. Thus, the Government of Sweden considers that the declaration made by San Marino, in the absence of further clarification, in substance constitutes a reservation to the Convention.

The Government of Sweden notes that the said articles of the Convention are being made subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of existing legislation in San Marino.

The Government of Sweden is of the view that, in the absence of further clarification, this reservation raises doubts as to the commitment of San Marino to the object and purpose of the Convention and would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of San Marino to the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between San Marino and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without San Marino benefiting from its reservation."

TURKEY

With regard to the declaration made by Cyprus upon ratification:

"The Republic of Cyprus, founded in 1960 as a partnership state in accordance with the international Cyprus Treaties by the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot communities, was destroyed in 1963 when the Greek Cypriot side threw the Turkish Cypriots out of the government and administration and thereby rendered the Government of Cyprus unconstitutional.

"Consequently, since December 1963, there has been no single political authority in Cyprus representing both communities and legitimate empowered to act on behalf of the whole island. The Greek Cypriot side does not possess the right or authority to become party to international instruments on behalf of Cyprus as a whole.

"The ratification of this Convention by Turkey shall in no way imply the recognition of the 'Republic of Cyprus' by Turkey and her accession to this Convention should not signify any obligation on the part of Turkey to enter into any dealings with the 'Republic of Cyprus' as are regulated by this Convention."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

27 December 1989

[*Same objection,* mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.*]

10 March 1997

With regard to the reservations made by Lebanon upon accession:

[*Same objection,* mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by France.*]

17 December 1998

With regard to the reservation to article 6 made by Viet Nam upon accession:

"The United Kingdom is not in a position to accept [the] reservation.

"The above objection is not however, to constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the said [Convention] as between Vietnam and the United Kingdom."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

23 October 1995

With regard to the reservations and declarations made by Colombia upon ratification:

"The Government of the United States of America understands the first reservation to exempt Colombia from the obligations imposed by article 3, paragraphs 6 and 9, and article 6 of the Convention only insofar as compliance with such obligations would prevent Colombia from abiding by article 35 of its Political Constitution (regarding the extradition of Colombian nationals by birth), to the extent that the reservation is intended to apply other than to the extradition of Colombian nationals by birth, the Government of the United States objects to the reservation.

"The Government of the United States of America objects to the first declaration, as it purports to subordinate Colombia's obligations under the Convention to its Constitution and international treaties, as well as to that nation's domestic legislation generally.

"The Government of the United States of America objects to the seventh declaration to the extent it purports to restrict the right of other States to freedom of navigation and other internationally lawful uses of the sea related to that freedom seaward of the outer limits of any State's territorial sea, determined in accordance with the International Law of the Sea as reflected in the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea."

Notifications under article 6, 7 and 17

(Unless otherwise indicated, the notifications were received upon ratification, accession, acceptance, approval, formal confirmation or succession.)

BARBADOS

23 June 1993

"... the Attorney-General has been designated as the authority for the purposes of articles 7 (8) and 17 (7) of the above-mentioned Convention and that English is the acceptable language for the purposes of paragraph 9 of said article 7. "

Brunei Darussalam

19 June 2007

"The competent authority under article 7 (8) is the following:

Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Jalan Subok Bandar Seri Begawan BD, 2710, Brunei Darussalam

Telephone: (673) 226 1177; Fax: (673) 226 1709;
Email: mfa@gov.bn

Cook Islands

24 March 2005

"(a) Article 6: Extradition

The Cook Islands Extradition Act 2003 provides for the extradition of persons to and from the Cook Islands.

The objects of the Act are to -

(a) codify the law relating to the extradition of persons from the Cook Islands; and

(b) facilitate the making of requests for extradition by the Cook Islands to other countries, and

(c) enable the Cook Islands to carry out its obligations under extradition treaties.

An offense under the Act is an extradition offence if -

1. (a) it is an offence against a law of the requesting country punishable

by death or imprisonment for not less than 12 months or the imposition of a fine of more than $5,000; and

(b) the conduct that constitutes an offence (however described) in the Cook Islands punishable by death or imprisonment for not less than 12 months or the imposition of a fine of more than $5,000.

2. In determining whether conduct constitutes an offence, regard may be had to only some of the acts and omissions that make up the conduct.

3. In determining the maximum penalty for an offence for which no statutory penalty is imposed, regard must be had to the level of penalty that can be imposed by any court in the requesting country for the offence.

4. An offence may be an extradition offence although:

(a) it is an offence against a law of the requesting country relating to taxation, customs duties or other revenue matters, or relating to foreign exchange controls; and

(b) the Cook Islands does not impose a duty, tax, impost or control of that kind.

(b) Article 7: Mutual Legal Assistance:

The authority in the Cook Islands with the responsibility and power to execute requests for mutual legal assistance is as follows:

Solicitor General, Crown Law Office, PO Box 494, Avarua, Rarotonga, Cook Islands. Tel: (682) 29 337; Fax: (682 20 839.

(c) Article 17: Illicit Traffic at Sea The authority in the Cook Islands with the responsibility for responding to requests for information on vessels flying the Cook Islands flag is as follows:

Secretary, Ministry of Transport, PO Box 61, Avarua, Rarotonga, Cook Islands. Tel: (682) 28 810; Fax: (682) 28 816."

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

31 May 2007

The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has designated the following authorities under the provisions of article 7 (8) and 17 (7), respectively.

Ministry of People's Security
Wasan-dong,
Sosong District
Pyongyang, DPR Korea.
Fax: +850-2-381-5833 Tel.: +850-2-381-5833

Maritime Administration Tonghun-dong Central District Pyongang, DPR Korea. Fax: +850-2-381-4410 Tel.: +850-2-18111 ext 8059 E-mail: Mab@silibank.com On the same date, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea notified the Secretary-General that English has been chosen as its language for the purpose of article 7 (9) of the Convention.

Ireland

1 February 2006

"... the authority now designated by Ireland under Article 17 (7) of the Convention is as follows:

Head of Unit
Liaison & Joint Operations
Customs Drugs Law Enforcement
Revenue Investigations & Prosecutions Division
Ashtown Gate
Dublin 15
Ireland
Telephone No. (office hours):
+ 353 1 827 7512
24 hour Telephone No. (outside office hours):
+ 353 87 254 8201 Fax: + 353 1 827 7680
E-mail address: antidrugs@revenue.ie
Office Hours : 0800 - 1800 (Monday-Friday)
Languages of incoming requests accepted: English
Time zone: GMT:+/-:0"

Nicaragua

31 July 2006

... the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua has designated the Attorney General of the Republic as the Central Authority in charge of fulfilling that which is stipulated in the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, done at Vienna on 20 December 1988.

Paraguay

&lt;Right&gt;3 September 2008</Right&gt;

Pursuant to the provisions of articles 7 (8) and 17 (7) of the aforementioned Convention, the Republic of Paraguay has designated the following institution as its Central authority:

Government Procurator's Department – Office of the Attorney-General – Department of International Affairs and External Legal Assistance

Address: Nuestra Señora de la Asunción 737 c/Haedo, Piso 8, Asunción, Paraguay

Telephone numbers: 595-21-498537/ 595-21-415-5000/ 595-21-415-5100

Website: www.ministeriopublico.gov.py

Director: Juan Emilio Oviedo Cabañas (lawyer)

E-mail: jeoviedo@ministeriopublico.gov.py

Alternative contact: Magdalena Quiñonez, Assistant Prosecutor

E-mail: mquinonez@ministeriopublico.gov.py

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 20 December 1988 and 3 January 1991, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia" and "Yugoslavia"

in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] On 7 July 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General that the Convention would apply to Macao.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received communications regarding the status of Macao from China and Portugal (see also note 3 under “China” and note 1 under “Portgual” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[3] The Secretary-General, received on 6 and 10 June 1997 communications regarding the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom of Great Brtiain and Northern Ireland (see also note 2 under “China” and note 2 under “United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume). .Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with declaration made by China will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 7 December 1989 and 4 June 1991, respectively. See also note 1 under “Czech Republic” and note 1 under “Slovakia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 21 June 1989 and 21 February 1990, respectively. The instrument of ratification contained the following declarations:

Requests for mutual legal assistance under article 7 shall be directed to the German Democratic Republic through diplomatic channel in one of the official United Nations languages or in the German language unless existing agreements on mutual legal assistance include other provisions or direct communication between legal authorities has been determined or developed on a mutual basis.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs shall be the competent authority to receive and respond to requests of another state to board or search a vessel suspected of being involved in illicit traffic (article 17).

See also note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] The signature was affixed for the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba. The instrument of acceptance specifies that it is for the Kingdom in Europe. As from 10 mars 1999: for the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba with the following reservation: “The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the provisions of article 3, paragraph 6, 7 and 8, only in so far as the obligations under these provisions are in accordance with Netherlands Antillean and Aruban criminal legislation and Netherlands Antillean and Aruban policy on criminal matters.”

[8] See note 1 under “New Zealand” regarding Tokelau in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] On 2 December 1993, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General that the Convention would apply to the Isle of Man with the following reservation:

"The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland will only consider the granting of immunity under article 7, paragraph 18, in relation to the Isle of Man, where this is specifically requested by the person to whom the immunity would apply or by the authority designated under article 7, paragraph 8 of the party from whom assistance is requested. A request for immunity will not be granted where the judicial authorities of the Isle of Man consider that to do so would be contrary to the public interest.”

Subsequently, in a notification received on 8 February 1995, the Government of the United Kingdom notified the Secretary-General that the Convention should apply, as from that same date, to the following territories: Anguilla, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Monserrat and Turks and Caicos Islands.

In this regard, on 6 August 1996, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the following communication:

"... In relation to the aformentioned Territories the granting of immunity under article 7, paragraph 18, of the said Convention will only be considered where this is specifically requested by the person to whom the immunity would apply or by the authority designated, under article 7, paragraph 8, of the Party from whom assistance is requested. A request for immunity will not be granted where the judicial authorities of the Territory in question consider to do so would be contrary to the public interest."

Further, on 15 May and 7 July 1997, respectively, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General that the Convention shall extend to Hong Kong *(see also note 2)* and the Bailiwick of Jersey. The applicatn of the Convention to the Bailiwick of Jersey is subject to the following reservation:

(1) article 7, paragraph 18 (Reservation)

"The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland will only consider the granting of immunity under article 7, paragraph 18, in relation to Jersey, where this is specifically requested by the person to whom the immunity would apply or by the authority designated under article 7, paragraph 8 of the party from whom assistance is requested. A request for immunity will not be granted where the judicial authorities of Jersey consider that to do so would be contrary to the public interest."

Further, on 3 April 2002, the Government of the United Kingdom informed the Secretary-General that the Convention would extend to Guernsey, with the following reservation:

"(1) Article 7, Paragraph 18 (Reservation)

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland will only consider the granting of immunity under Article 7, Paragraph 18, in relation to Guernsey, where this is specifically requested by the person to whom the immunity would apply or by the authority designated under Article 7, Paragraph 8 of the party from whom assistance is requested. A request for immunity will not be granted where the judicial authorities of Guernsey consider that to do so would be contrary to the public interest.

[10] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[11] The Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel objections identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis* , as the one referenced in note 17 in chapter VI.16, on 14 May 1990 in regard to the declaration made by Bahrain upon ratification, on 15 November 1991 in regard to the declaration made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession and on 10 April 1992 in regard to the declaration made by Saudi Arabia upon accession.

[12] On 30 December 1997, the Government of Colombia notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with regard to article 3 (6) and (9) and article 6 made upon ratification. The reservation reads as follows.

1. Colombia is not bound by article 3, paragraphs 6 and 9, or article 6 of the Convention since they contravene article 35 of the Political Constitution of Colombia regarding the prohibition on extraditing Colombians by birth.

[13] On 10 December 1996, the Government of Jamaica informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its declaration made upon accession. The declaration read as follows:

Declaration:

"The Government of Jamaica understands paragraph 11 of article 17 of the said Convention to mean that the consent of the coastal State is required as a precondition for action under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 17 of the said Convention in relation to the Exclusive Economic Zone and all other maritime areas under the sovereignty or jurisdiction of the coastal State."

[14] In regard to the reservation made by Lebanon, the Secretary-General received communications identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis* , as the one made by France under ***Objections"*** , from the following Governments on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Participants:	***Date of the communication:***		
Austria	11	Jul	1997
Greece	18	Jul	1997

[15] On 24 July 1997, the Government of the Philippines informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservations made upon accession, which read as follows:

"[The Government of the Philippines declares] that it does not consider itself bound by the following provisions:

1. " Paragraph 1 (b) (i) and paragraph 2 (a) (ii) of article 4 on jurisdiction;

2. "Paragraph 1 (a) and paragraph 6 (a) and (b) of article 5 on confiscation; and

3. "Paragraph 9 (a) and (b) and 10 of article on extradition.".

On that same date, the Government of the Philippines declared the following:

"The Philippines, does not consider itself bound by the mandatory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice as provided for in article 32, paragraph 2 of the same Convention."

In keeping with the depositary practice followed in similar cases, the Secretary-General proposed to receive the declaration in question for deposit (in the absence of any objection on the part of any of the Contracting States, either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged) within a period of 90 days from the date of the present notification (3 September 1997). No objection having been recieved within the said period, the above declaration was deemed accepted for deposit upon the expiration of the 90-day period, that is to say on 2 December 1997.

[16] In a communication received on 15 January 1999, the Government of Finland notified the Secretary-General of the following:

"The Government of Finland is of the view that [this reservation] raise[s] doubts as to [its] compatibility with the object and purpose of the [Convention] concerned, in particular the [reservation] to article 6, paragraphs 2 and 9. According to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, and well-established customary international law, a reservation contrary to the object and purpose of the treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become Parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all Parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to [this reservation] made by the Government of Viet Nam to the [Convention].

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the [Convention] between Viet Nam and Finland. The [Convention] will thus become operative between the two States without Viet Nam benefitting from [this reservation].

CHAPTER VII

TRAFFIC IN PERSONS

1. PROTOCOL SIGNED AT LAKE SUCCESS, NEW YORK, ON 12 NOVEMBER 1947, TO AMEND THE CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN, CONCLUDED AT GENEVA ON 30 SEPTEMBER 1921, AND THE CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRAFFIC IN WOMEN OF FULL AGE, CONCLUDED AT GENEVA ON 11 OCTOBER 1933

Lake Success, New York, 12 November 1947

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	12 November 1947, in accordance with article V.[1]
REGISTRATION:	24 April 1950, No. 770.
STATUS:	Signatories: 8. Parties: 42.
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 53, p. 13.

Note: The Protocol was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 126 (II)[2] of 20 October 1947.

The Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others, concluded at Lake Success, New York of 21 March 1950 consolidates the Protocols, Conventions and Agreements listed in the present chapter under Nos. 1 to 10. Furthermore, the Convention of 21 March 1950 supercedes the provisions of the above-referenced instruments in the relations between the Parties thereto and shall terminate such instruments when all the Parties thereto shall have become Parties to the Convention of 21 March 1950, in accordance with its article 28.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature(s), Acceptance(A), Succession(d)*
Afghanistan		12 Nov 1947 s
Albania		25 Jul 1949 A
Australia		13 Nov 1947 s
Austria		7 Jun 1950 s
Belgium		12 Nov 1947 s
Brazil	17 Mar 1948	6 Apr 1950 A
Canada		24 Nov 1947 s
China[3]		12 Nov 1947 s
Côte d'Ivoire		5 Nov 1962 s
Cuba		16 Mar 1981 A
Czech Republic[4]		30 Dec 1993 d
Denmark	12 Nov 1947	21 Nov 1949 A
Egypt		12 Nov 1947 s
Finland		6 Jan 1949 A
Germany[5,6]		29 May 1973 A
Greece	9 Mar 1951	5 Apr 1960 A
Hungary		2 Feb 1950 s
India		12 Nov 1947 s
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 Jul 1953	
Ireland		19 Jul 1961 A
Italy		5 Jan 1949 A
Jamaica		16 Mar 1965 A
Lebanon		12 Nov 1947 s
Luxembourg	12 Nov 1947	14 Mar 1955 A
Malta		27 Feb 1975 A
Mexico		12 Nov 1947 s
Myanmar		13 May 1949 s
Netherlands	12 Nov 1947	7 Mar 1949 A
Nicaragua	12 Nov 1947	24 Apr 1950 A
Niger		7 Dec 1964 A
Norway	12 Nov 1947	28 Nov 1947 A
Pakistan		12 Nov 1947 s
Poland		21 Dec 1950 A
Romania		2 Nov 1950 s
Russian Federation		18 Dec 1947 s
Serbia[7]		12 Mar 2001 d
Sierra Leone		13 Aug 1962 s
Singapore		26 Oct 1966 A
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 d
South Africa		12 Nov 1947 s
Sweden		9 Jun 1948 s
Syrian Arab Republic		17 Nov 1947 s
Turkey		12 Nov 1947 s

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon definitive signature or acceptance.)

CUBA

The Government of the Republic of Cuba declares that article 10 of the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, concluded at Geneva on 30 September 1921, and article 7 of the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age, concluded at Geneva on 11 October 1933, as amended in the annex to the Protocol done at Lake Success, New York, on 12 November 1947, are discriminatory in that they deny States which are not Members of the United Nations and to which the Economic and Social Council does not officially communicate the Conventions as amended by the Protocol the right to accede to the Conventions as so amended, this being contrary to the principle of sovereign equality of States.

MALTA

"In accepting the above-mentioned Protocol, Malta considers itself bound only in so far as the Protocol applies to the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children concluded at Geneva on 30 September 1921 to which Malta is a party."

PAKISTAN

"In accordance with paragraph 4 of the *Schedule to the Indian Independence Order, 1947* , Pakistan considers herself a party to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children concluded at Geneva on 30 September 1921 by the fact that India became a party to the above-mentioned Convention before 15 August 1947."

Notes:

[1] The amendments set forth in the annex to the Protocol entered into force in respect of both Conventions on 24 April 1950, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article V of the Protocol.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Resolutions* (A/519), p. 32.

[3] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed the Protocol definitively on 12 November 1947. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] The German Democratic Republic had accepted the Protocol on 16 July 1974. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The instrument of acceptance by the Federal Republic of Germany was accompanied by the following declaration:

". . . The said Protocol shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany."

See also note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] The former Yugoslavia had signed the Protocol definitively on 12 November 1947. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN, CONCLUDED AT GENEVA ON 30 SEPTEMBER 1921, AS AMENDED BY THE PROTOCOL SIGNED AT LAKE SUCCESS, NEW YORK, ON 12 NOVEMBER 1947

Lake Success, 12 November 1947

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	24 April 1950, the date on which the amendments set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 12 November 1947 entered into force, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article V of the Protocol.
REGISTRATION:	24 April 1950, No. 771.
STATUS:	Parties: 46.
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 53, p. 39.

Note: The Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others, concluded at Lake Success, New York of 21 March 1950 consolidates the Protocols, Conventions and Agreements listed in the present chapter under Nos. 1 to 10. Furthermore, the Convention of 21 March 1950 supercedes the provisions of the above-referenced instruments in the relations between the Parties thereto and shall terminate such instruments when all the Parties thereto shall have become Parties to the Convention of 21 March 1950, in accordance with its article 28.

Participant	*Definitive signature of the Protocol, Acceptance of the Protocol, Succession to the Protocol*	*Accession to the Convention as amended by the Protocol(a), Succession to the Convention as amended by the Protocol(d)*
Afghanistan	12 Nov 1947	
Albania	25 Jul 1949	
Algeria		31 Oct 1963 a
Australia	13 Nov 1947	
Austria	7 Jun 1950	
Belgium	12 Nov 1947	
Brazil	6 Apr 1950	
Canada	24 Nov 1947	
China[1]	12 Nov 1947	
Cuba	16 Mar 1981	
Czech Republic[2]	30 Dec 1993	
Denmark	21 Nov 1949	
Egypt	12 Nov 1947	
Finland	6 Jan 1949	
Germany[3]	29 May 1973	
Greece	5 Apr 1960	
Hungary	2 Feb 1950	
India	12 Nov 1947	
Ireland	19 Jul 1961	
Italy	5 Jan 1949	
Jamaica	16 Mar 1965	
Lebanon	12 Nov 1947	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		17 Feb 1959 a
Luxembourg	14 Mar 1955	
Madagascar		18 Feb 1963 a
Malawi		25 Feb 1966 a
Malta	27 Feb 1975	
Mexico	12 Nov 1947	
Montenegro[4]		23 Oct 2006 d
Myanmar	13 May 1949	
Netherlands	7 Mar 1949	
Nicaragua	24 Apr 1950	
Norway	28 Nov 1947	
Pakistan	12 Nov 1947	
Philippines		30 Sep 1954 a
Poland	21 Dec 1950	
Romania	2 Nov 1950	
Russian Federation	18 Dec 1947	
Serbia[5]		12 Mar 2001 d
Sierra Leone	13 Aug 1962	
Singapore	26 Oct 1966	
Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993	
South Africa	12 Nov 1947	
Sweden	9 Jun 1948	
Syrian Arab Republic	17 Nov 1947	
Turkey	12 Nov 1947	

Declarations and Reservations

[See the text of the declarations and reservations in respect of the unamended Convention (chapter VII.5) and the amending Protocol of 12 November 1947 (chapter VII.1).]

Notes:

[1] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[2] The Protocol of 12 November 1947 amending the Agreement, having been signed definitively on 12 November 1947 by the Government of Czechoslovakia, the latter applied the Convention as amended as from that date. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] A notification of reapplication of the Convention of 30 September 1921 was received on 21 February 1974 from the Government of the German Democratic Republic. An instrument of acceptance of the Protocol of 12 November 1947 amending the Agreement having been deposited with the Secretary-General on 16 July 1974 on behalf of the German Democratic Republic, the latter applied the Convention as amended since 16 July 1974. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] The former Yugoslavia had signed the Protocol definitively on 12 November 1947. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

3. INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN

Geneva, 30 September 1921

REGISTRATION: 15 June 1922, No. 269.[1]

Note: The Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others, concluded at Lake Success, New York of 21 March 1950 consolidates the Protocols, Conventions and Agreements listed in the present chapter under Nos. 1 to 10. Furthermore, the Convention of 21 March 1950 supercedes the provisions of the above-referenced instruments in the relations between the Parties thereto and shall terminate such instruments when all the Parties thereto shall have become Parties to the Convention of 21 March 1950, in accordance with its article 28.

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Afghanistan
(April 10th,1935 *a*)

Albania
(October 13th, 1924)

Austria
(August 9th, 1922)

Belgium
(June 15th, 1922)

Brazil
(August 18th, 1933)

British Empire[2]
(June 28th, 1922)

Does not include the Island of Newfoundland, the British Colonies and Protectorates, the Island of Nauru, or any territories administered under mandates by Great Britain.

Bahamas, Barbados, British Honduras,Ceylon,Cyprus, Gibraltar, Grenada, Hong-Kong, Kenya (Colony and Protectorate), Malta, Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Seychelles, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Southern Rhodesia, Straits Settlements, Trinidad and Tobago
(September 18th, 1922 a)

British Guiana and Fiji
(October 24th, 1922 a)

Jamaica and Mauritius
(March 7th, 1924 a)

Leeward Islands
(March 7th, 1924 a)

Falkland Islands and Dependencies
(May 8th, 1924 a)

Gold Coast Colony
(July 3rd, 1924 a)

Sierra Leone (Colony)
(November 16th, 1927 a)

Gambia (Colony and Protectorate), Tanganyika (Territory), Uganda (Protectorate)
(April 10th, 1931 a)

British Solomon Islands (Protectorate), Gilbert and Ellice Islands (Colony), Palestine (including Trans-Jordan), Sarawak (Protected State)
(November 2nd, 1931 a)

Zanzibar (Protectorate)
(January 14th, 1932 a)

Burma[3]

Burma reserves the right at her discretion to substitute the age of 16 years or any greater age that may be subsequently decided upon for the age-limit prescribed in paragraph B of the Final Protocol of the Convention of May 4th, 1910, and under Article 5 of the 1921 Convention.

Canada
(June 28th, 1922)

Australia
(June 28th, 1922)

Does not include Papua, Norfolk Island and the mandated territory of New Guinea.

Papua, Norfolk Island, New Guinea, Nauru
(September 2nd, 1936)

New Zealand
(June 28th, 1922)

Does not include the mandated territory of Western Samoa.

Union of South Africa
(June 28th, 1922)

Ireland
(May 18th, 1934 a)

India
(June 28th, 1922)

Reserves the right at its discretion to substitute the age of 16 years or any greater age that may be subsequently decided upon for the age-limit prescribed in paragraph (*b*) of the Final Protocol of the Convention of May 4th, 1910, and in Article 5 of the present Convention.

Bulgaria
(April 29th, 1925 a)

Chile
(January 15th, 1929)

China[2,4,5]
(February 24th, 1926)

Colombia
(November 8th, 1934)

Cuba
(May 7th, 1923)

Czechoslovakia[6]
(September 29th, 1923)

Denmark[7]
(April 23rd, 1931 a)

This ratification does not include Greenland, the Convention, in view of the special circumstances, being of no interest for that possession.

Egypt
(April 13th, 1932 a)

Estonia
(February 28th, 1930)

Finland
(August 16th, 1926 a)

France
(March 1st, 1926 a)

Does not include the French Colonies, the countries in the French Protectorate or the territories under French mandate.

Syria and Lebanon
(June 2nd, 1930 a)

Germany[8]
(July 8th, 1924)

Greece
(April 9th, 1923)

Hungary
(April 25th, 1925)

Iran
(March 28th, 1933)

Iraq
(May 15th, 1925 a)

The Government of Iraq desire to reserve to themselves the right to fix an age-limit lower than that specified in Article 5 of the Convention.

Italy
(June 30th, 1924)

Italian Colonies
(July 27th, 1922 a)

Subject to the age-limit for native women and children, referred to in Article 5, being reduced from twenty-one to sixteen years.

Japan
(December 15th, 1925)

Does not include Chosen, Taiwan, the leased Territory of Kwantung, the Japanese portion of Saghalien Island and Japan's mandated territory in the South Seas.

Latvia
(February 12th, 1924)

Lithuania
(September 14th, 1931)

Luxembourg
(December 31st, 1929 a)

Mexico
(May 10th, 1932 a)

Monaco
(July 18th, 1931 a)

Netherlands
(including *Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao*)
(September 19th, 1923)

Nicaragua
(December 12th, 1935 a)

Norway
(August 16th, 1922)

Poland
(October 8th, 1924)

Portugal[5]
(December 1st, 1923)

Romania
(September 5th, 1923)

Spain
(May 12th, 1924 a)

Does not include the Spanish Possessions in Africa or the territories of the Spanish Protectorate in Morocco.

Sudan (Anglo-Egyptian Condominium)
(June 1st, 1932 a)

Sweden
(June 9th, 1925)

Switzerland
(January 20th, 1926)

Thailand
(July 13th, 1922)

With reservation as to the age-limit prescribed in paragraph (*b*) of the Final Protocol of the Convention of 1910 and Article 5 of this Convention, in so far as concerns the nationals of Thailand.

Turkey
(April 15th, 1937 a)

Uruguay
(October 21st, 1924 a)

Yugoslavia (former)[9]
(May 2nd, 1929 a)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Argentina *(a)*
Costa Rica
Panama (*a*)
Peru (*a*)

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[5,8]	***Accession(a), Succession(d)***
Bahamas	10 Jun 1976 d
Belarus	21 May 1948 a
Cyprus	16 May 1963 d
Czech Republic[6]	30 Dec 1993 d

Participant[5,8]	***Accession(a), Succession(d)***
Fiji	12 Jun 1972 d
Ghana	7 Apr 1958 d
Jamaica	30 Jul 1964 d
Malta	24 Mar 1967 d

Participant[5,8]	*Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 d
Pakistan	12 Nov 1947 d
Russian Federation	18 Dec 1947 a
Sierra Leone	13 Mar 1962 d
Singapore	7 Jun 1966 d
Slovakia[6]	28 May 1993 d

Participant[5,8]	*Accession(a), Succession(d)*
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[9]	18 Jan 1994 d
Trinidad and Tobago	11 Apr 1966 d
Zambia	26 Mar 1973 d
Zimbabwe	1 Dec 1998 d

Notes:

[1] See League of Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 9, p. 415.

In accordance with its Article 11, the Convention entered into force in respect of each Party on the date of the deposit of its ratification or act of accession.

[2] On 6 and 10 June 1997, respectively, Secretary-General received communications regarding the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

[3] See note 1 under "Myanmar" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[5] On 11 August 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General that the Convention would apply to Macao.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received communications regarding the status of Macao from China and Portugal (see note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portgual" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[6] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] According to a reservation made by the Danish Government when ratifying the Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Denmark, only upon the coming into force of the Danish Penal Code of April 15th, 1930. This Code having entered into force on January 1st, 1933, the Convention has become effective for Denmark from the same date.

[8] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as from 8 March 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received on 2 March 1976 the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974, concerning the application, as from 8 March 1958, of the International Convention of 30 September 1921 for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the International Convention when it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] See note 1 regarding "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

4. INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRAFFIC IN WOMEN OF FULL AGE, CONCLUDED AT GENEVA ON 11 OCTOBER 1933, AS AMENDED BY THE PROTOCOL SIGNED AT LAKE SUCCESS, NEW YORK, ON 12 NOVEMBER 1947

Lake Success, 12 November 1947

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	24 April 1950, the date on which the amendments set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 12 November 1947 entered into force, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article V of the Protocol.
REGISTRATION:	24 April 1950, No. 772.
STATUS:	Parties: 31.
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 53, p. 49.

Note: The Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others, concluded at Lake Success, New York of 21 March 1950 consolidates the Protocols, Conventions and Agreements listed in the present chapter under Nos. 1 to 10. Furthermore, the Convention of 21 March 1950 supercedes the provisions of the above-referenced instruments in the relations between the Parties thereto and shall terminate such instruments when all the Parties thereto shall have become Parties to the Convention of 21 March 1950, in accordance with its article 28.

Participant[1]	*Definitive signature of the Protocol, Acceptance of the Protocol, Succession to the Protocol*	*Accession to the Convention as amended by the Protocol(a)*
Afghanistan	12 Nov 1947	
Algeria		31 Oct 1963 a
Australia	13 Nov 1947	
Austria	7 Jun 1950	
Belgium	12 Nov 1947	
Brazil	6 Apr 1950	
Côte d'Ivoire	5 Nov 1962	
Cuba	16 Mar 1981	
Czech Republic[2]	30 Dec 1993	
Finland	6 Jan 1949	
Greece	5 Apr 1960	
Hungary	2 Feb 1950	
Ireland	19 Jul 1961	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		17 Feb 1959 a
Luxembourg		14 Mar 1955 a
Madagascar		12 Feb 1964 a
Mali		2 Feb 1973 a
Mexico	12 Nov 1947	
Netherlands	7 Mar 1949	
Nicaragua	24 Apr 1950	
Niger	7 Dec 1964	
Norway	28 Nov 1947	
Philippines		30 Sep 1954 a
Poland	21 Dec 1950	
Romania	2 Nov 1950	
Russian Federation	18 Dec 1947	
Singapore		26 Oct 1966 a
Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993	
South Africa	12 Nov 1947	
Sweden	9 Jun 1948	
Turkey	12 Nov 1947	

Notes:

[1] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, as amended by the Protocol of 12 November 1947, with a reservation and a declaration, on 16 July 1974. For the text of the reservation and declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 943, p. 335. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] The Protocol of 12 November 1947 amending the Convention having been signed definitively on 12 November 1947 by the Government of Czechoslovakia, the latter applied the Convention as amended as from that date. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

5. INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRAFFIC IN WOMEN OF FULL AGE

Geneva, 11 October 1933

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 August 1934, in accordance with article 8.
REGISTRATION: 24 August 1934, No. 3476.[1]

Note: The Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others, concluded at Lake Success, New York of 21 March 1950 consolidates the Protocols, Conventions and Agreements listed in the present chapter under Nos. 1 to 10. Furthermore, the Convention of 21 March 1950 supercedes the provisions of the above-referenced instruments in the relations between the Parties thereto and shall terminate such instruments when all the Parties thereto shall have become Parties to the Convention of 21 March 1950, in accordance with its article 28.

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Afghanistan	(April 10th, 1935 a)
Australia (Including *Papua* and *Norfolk Island* and the mandated territories of *New Guinea* and *Nauru* .)	(September 2nd, 1936)
Austria	(August 7th, 1936)
Union of South Africa	(November 20th, 1935)
Belgium With reservation as regards Article 10.	(June 11th, 1936)
Brazil	(June 24th, 1938 a)
Bulgaria	(December 19th, 1934)
Chile	(March 20th, 1935)
Cuba	(June 25th, 1936 a)
Czechoslovakia[2]	(July 27th, 1935)
Finland	(December 21st, 1936 a)
Greece	(August 20th, 1937)
Hungary	(August 12th, 1935)
Iran	(April 12th, 1935 a)
Ireland	(May 25th, 1938 a)
Latvia	(September 17th, 1935)
Mexico	(May 3rd, 1938 a)
Netherlands (including the *Netherlands Indies* , *Surinam* and *Curaçao*)	(September 20th, 1935)
Nicaragua	(December 12th, 1935 a)
Norway	(June 26th, 1935 a)
Poland	(December 8th, 1937)
Portugal[3]	(January 7th, 1937)
Romania	(June 6th, 1935 a)
Sudan	(June 13th, 1934 a)
Sweden	(June 25th, 1934)
Switzerland	(July 17th, 1934)
Turkey	(March 19th, 1941 a)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Albania
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and *all parts of the British Empire which are not separate members of the League of Nations.*
China
Germany
Lithuania
Monaco
Panama
Spain
Yugoslavia (former)[4]

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[3]	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Belarus	21 May 1948 a
Benin	4 Apr 1962 d
Cameroon	27 Oct 1961 d
Central African Republic	4 Sep 1962 d
Congo	15 Oct 1962 d
Côte d'Ivoire	8 Dec 1961 d
Czech Republic[2]	30 Dec 1993 d
France	8 Jan 1947
Niger	25 Aug 1961 d
Russian Federation	18 Dec 1947 a
Senegal	2 May 1963 d
Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993 d

Notes:

[1] See League of Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 150, p. 431.

[2] See note 1 under “Czech Republic” and note 1 under “Slovakia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] On 21 October 1999 and 13 December 1999, the Secretary-General received communications regarding the status of Macao from Portgual and China (see also note 3 under “China” and note 1 under “Portgual” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

From 20 December 1999 onwards the Portuguese Republic will cease to be responsible for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Convention to Macau.

[4] See note 1 under “Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

6. Protocol amending the International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 18 May 1904, and the International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910

Lake Success, New York, 4 May 1949

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 4 May 1949, in accordance with article 5.[1]
REGISTRATION: 4 May 1949, No. 446.
STATUS: Signatories: 13. Parties: 33.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 30, p. 23.

Note: The Protocol was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 256 (III)[2] of 3 December 1948.

The Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others, concluded at Lake Success, New York of 21 March 1950 consolidates the Protocols, Conventions and Agreements listed in the present chapter under Nos. 1 to 10. Furthermore, the Convention of 21 March 1950 supercedes the provisions of the above-referenced instruments in the relations between the Parties thereto and shall terminate such instruments when all the Parties thereto shall have become Parties to the Convention of 21 March 1950, in accordance with its article 28.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature(s), Acceptance(A), Succession(d)*
Australia[3]		8 Dec 1949 s
Austria		7 Jun 1950 s
Bahamas		10 Jun 1976 d
Belgium	20 May 1949	13 Oct 1952 A
Brazil	4 May 1949	
Canada		4 May 1949 s
Chile		20 Jun 1949 s
China[4,5]		4 May 1949 s
Cuba	4 May 1949	4 Aug 1965 A
Czech Republic[6]		30 Dec 1993 d
Denmark	21 Nov 1949	1 Mar 1950 A
Egypt	9 May 1949	16 Sep 1949 A
Fiji		12 Jun 1972 d
Finland		31 Oct 1949 A
France		5 May 1949 s
Germany[7,8]		29 May 1973 A
India	12 May 1949	28 Dec 1949 A
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	28 Dec 1949	30 Dec 1959 A
Iraq		1 Jun 1949 s
Ireland		19 Jul 1961 A
Italy		13 Nov 1952 A
Luxembourg	4 May 1949	14 Mar 1955 A
Netherlands	2 Jun 1949	26 Sep 1950 A
Norway		4 May 1949 s
Pakistan	13 May 1949	16 Jun 1952 A
Serbia[9]		12 Mar 2001 d
Slovakia[6]		28 May 1993 d
South Africa	22 Aug 1950	14 Aug 1951 A
Sri Lanka		14 Jul 1949 s
Sweden		25 Feb 1952 s
Switzerland		23 Sep 1949 A
Turkey	4 May 1949	13 Sep 1950 A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[4]		4 May 1949 s
United States of America	4 May 1949	14 Aug 1950 A

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon definitive signature, acceptance or succession.)

CUBA

The Revolutionary Government of Cuba ratifies the present Protocol in order to co-operate in the supervision by the United Nations, as depositary, of all treaties drawn up prior to its establishment by international organizations which have ceased to exist, since, owing to the social and economic measures taken in Cuba under the revolutionary laws to increase employment opportunities for the mass of the people, the white slave traffic has been stamped out, the social evils inherited from former periods which were its main cause, unemployment and idleness, having been eliminated; and moreover, the fact that this Protocol shall likewise apply to colonial countries on a basis of equality shall not be taken to mean any acceptance of the position of subjection of these countries, since not only is it a fundamental principle of Cuba's present policy strongly to condemn colonialism and to proclaim the right of peoples under colonial rule to achieve national liberation, but colonialism has been denounced by the United Nations.

Notes:

[1] The amendments set forth in the annex to the Protocol entered into force on 21 June 1951 in respect of the Agreement of 18 May 1904, and on 14 August 1951 in respect of the Convention of 4 May 1910, in accordance with the second paragraph of article 5 of the Protocol.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Part I, Resolutions (A/810),* p. 164.

[3] In a notification made on signature, the Government of Australia declared that it extends the application of the Protocol to all territories for the conduct of whose foreign relations Australia is responsible.

[4] On 6 and 10 June 1997, respectively, Secretary-General received communications regarding the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Agreement of 18 May 1904, the Convention of 4 May 1910 and the Protocol of 4 May 1949 amending both the Agreement and the Convention will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

[5] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[6] Czechoslovakia had signed and accepted the Protocol of 4 May 1949 on 9 May 1949 and 21 June 1951, respectively. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] The German Democratic Republic had accepted the Protocol with a declaration on 16 July 1974. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 943, p. 329. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] The former Yugoslavia had signed and accepted the Protocol on 4 May 1949 and 26 April 1951, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

7. International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 18 May 1904, amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, 4 May 1949

Lake Success, New York, 4 May 1949

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 June 1951, the date on which the amendments set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 4 May 1949 entered into force, in accordance with the second paragraph of article 5 of the Protocol.

REGISTRATION: 21 June 1951, No. 1257.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 92, p. 19.

Note: The Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others, concluded at Lake Success, New York of 21 March 1950 consolidates the Protocols, Conventions and Agreements listed in the present chapter under Nos. 1 to 10. Furthermore, the Convention of 21 March 1950 supercedes the provisions of the above-referenced instruments in the relations between the Parties thereto and shall terminate such instruments when all the Parties thereto shall have become Parties to the Convention of 21 March 1950, in accordance with its article 28.

Participant	*Definitive signature of the Protocol, Succession to the Agreement and the Protocol, Acceptance of the Protocol*	*Accession to the Agreement as amended by the Protocol(a), Succession to the Agreement as amended by the Protocol(d)*
Algeria		31 Oct 1963 a
Australia	8 Dec 1949	
Austria	7 Jun 1950	
Bahamas	10 Jun 1976	
Belgium	13 Oct 1952	
Benin		4 Apr 1962 d
Cameroon		3 Nov 1961 d
Canada	4 May 1949	
Central African Republic		4 Sep 1962 d
Chile	20 Jun 1949	
China[1,2]	4 May 1949	
Congo		15 Oct 1962 d
Côte d'Ivoire		8 Dec 1961 d
Cuba	4 Aug 1965	
Cyprus		16 May 1963 d
Czech Republic[3]	30 Dec 1993	
Denmark	1 Mar 1950	
Egypt	16 Sep 1949	
Fiji	12 Jun 1972	
Finland	31 Oct 1949	
France	5 May 1949	
Germany[4]	29 May 1973	
Ghana		7 Apr 1958 d
India	28 Dec 1949	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	30 Dec 1959	
Iraq	1 Jun 1949	
Ireland	19 Jul 1961	
Italy	13 Nov 1952	
Jamaica		30 Jul 1964 d
Luxembourg	14 Mar 1955	
Madagascar		9 Oct 1963 d
Malawi		10 Jun 1965 a
Mali		2 Feb 1973 d
Malta		24 Mar 1967 d
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 d
Mexico		21 Feb 1956 a
Montenegro[5]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		7 Nov 1956 d
Netherlands	26 Sep 1950	
Niger		25 Aug 1961 d
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 d
Norway	4 May 1949	
Pakistan	16 Jun 1952	
Senegal		2 May 1963 d
Serbia[6]		12 Mar 2001 d
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 d
Singapore		7 Jun 1966 d
Slovakia[3]	28 May 1993	

Participant	*Definitive signature of the Protocol, Succession to the Agreement and the Protocol, Acceptance of the Protocol*	*Accession to the Agreement as amended by the Protocol(a), Succession to the Agreement as amended by the Protocol(d)*
South Africa	14 Aug 1951	
Sri Lanka	14 Jul 1949	
Sweden	25 Feb 1952	
Switzerland	23 Sep 1949	
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 d
Turkey	13 Sep 1950	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[1]	4 May 1949	
United Republic of Tanzania		18 Mar 1963 a
United States of America	14 Aug 1950	
Zambia		26 Mar 1973 d

Declarations and Reservations

[See the text of the declarations and reservations in respect of the unamended Agreement (chapter VII.8) and the amending Protocol of 4 May 1949 (chapter VII.6).]

Notes:

[1] On 6 and 10 June 1997, respectively, Secretary-General received communications regarding the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Agreement of 18 May 1904, the Convention of 4 May 1910 and the Protocol of 4 May 1949 amending both the Agreement and the Convention will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

[2] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[3] Czechoslovakia had accepted the Protocol of 4 May 1949, on 21 June 1951. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] A notification of reapplication of the Agreement of 18 May 1904 was received on 16 July 1974 from the Government of the German Democratic Republic. As an instrument of acceptance of the amending Protocol of 4 May 1949 was deposited with the Secretary-General on the same date on behalf of the Government of the German Democratic Republic, the latter has been applying the Agreement as amended since 16 July 1974. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The former Yugoslavia had signed and accepted the Protocol on 4 May 1949 and 26 April 1951, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

8. INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE "WHITE SLAVE TRAFFIC"

Paris, 18 May 1904

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 18 July 1905, in accordance with article 8.
REGISTRATION: 7 September 1920, No. 11.[1]

Note: The Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others, concluded at Lake Success, New York of 21 March 1950 consolidates the Protocols, Conventions and Agreements listed in the present chapter under Nos. 1 to 10. Furthermore, the Convention of 21 March 1950 supercedes the provisions of the above-referenced instruments in the relations between the Parties thereto and shall terminate such instruments when all the Parties thereto shall have become Parties to the Convention of 21 March 1950, in accordance with its article 28.

The following list was provided by the Government of France at the time of the transfer to the Secretary-General of the depositary functions in respect of the Agreement.

(1) States which ratified the Agreement

Belgium
Denmark
France
Germany[2]
Italy
Netherlands
Portugal
Russia
Spain
Sweden and Norway
Switzerland
United Kingdom[3]

(2) States which acceded to the Agreement

Austria-Hungary
Brazil
Bulgaria
Colombia
Czechoslovakia[4]
Lebanon[5]
Luxembourg
Poland
United States of America

(3) The Agreement was declared applicable to the following colonies, dominions and protectorates

German colonies
Iceland and Danish West Indies
Australia
Bahamas
Barbados
British Central Africa
British Guinea and Guiana
British Solomon Islands
Canada
Fiji Islands
Gambia
Gibraltar
Gilbert and Ellice Islands
Gold Coast
Hong Kong
India
Jamaica
Leeward Islands
Malta
Burma
New Zealand
Northern Nigeria
Palestine and Transjordan
St. Helena
Sarawak
Seychelles
Sierra Leone
Somaliland
Southern Rhodesia
Ceylon
Trinidad
Uganda
Wei-hai-wei
Windward Islands
Zanzibar
French colonies
Eritrea
Netherlands colonies

(4) The following colonies, dominions and protectorates consented to concur in article I of the Agreement

Basutoland
Bechuanaland
Bermuda
British East Africa
British Honduras
Cape Town

Cyprus
Natal
Orange River Colony
Southern Nigeria
Straits Settlements
Transvaal

(5) States and territories on behalf of which accession to the Convention of 4 May 1910 on the White Slave Traffic entailed ipso facto accession to the Agreement of 18 May 1904 by virtue of article 8 of the Convention of 1910

Chile
Cuba
Egypt
Finland
Irish Free State
Lithuania
Norway
Persia
Siam
Estonia
Newfoundland
Tanganyika
Union of South Africa
Kenya
Nyasaland
Papua and Norfolk
Grenada
St. Lucia

St. Vincent
Isle of Man
Japan
China
Yugoslavia (former)[6]
New Guinea
Nauru
Jersey
Guernsey
Falkland Islands (Malvinas)
Iraq
Sudan
Turkey
Uruguay
Monaco
Morocco
Tunisia
Mauritius

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[2]	*Succession(d)*
Bahamas	10 Jun 1976 d
Czech Republic[4]	30 Dec 1993 d
Fiji	12 Jun 1972 d
Slovakia[4]	28 May 1993 d
Zimbabwe	1 Dec 1998 d

Notes:

[1] See League of Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. I, p. 83.

[2] In a notification received on 16 July 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Agreement as from 10 August 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 2 March 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 17 June 1974, concerning the application, as from 10 August 1958, of the International Agreement of 18 May 1904 for the Suppression of the "White Slave Traffic", the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the International Agreement for the Suppression of the `White Slave Traffic', May 18th, 1904 to which it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See also note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] On 6 and 10 June 1997, respectively, Secretary-General received communications regarding the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Agreement of 18 May 1904, the Convention of 4 May 1910 and the Protocol of 4 May 1949 amending both the Agreement and the Convention will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

[4] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] The instrument of accession by the Government of Lebanon was deposited with the Secretary-General on 20 June 1949.

[6] See note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

9. International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910, amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, 4 May 1949

Lake Success, New York, 4 May 1949

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	14 August 1951, the date on which the amendments set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 4 May 1949 entered into force, in accordance with the second paragraph of article 5 of the Protocol.
REGISTRATION:	14 August 1951, No. 1358.
STATUS:	Parties: 54.
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 98, p. 101.

Note: The Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others, concluded at Lake Success, New York of 21 March 1950 consolidates the Protocols, Conventions and Agreements listed in the present chapter under Nos. 1 to 10. Furthermore, the Convention of 21 March 1950 supercedes the provisions of the above-referenced instruments in the relations between the Parties thereto and shall terminate such instruments when all the Parties thereto shall have become Parties to the Convention of 21 March 1950, in accordance with its article 28.

Participant[1]	*Definitive signature of the Protocol, Acceptance of the Protocol, Succession to the Convention and the Protocol*	*Accession to the Convention as amended by the Protocol(a), Succession to the Convention as amended by the Protocol(d)*
Algeria		31 Oct 1963 a
Australia	8 Dec 1949	
Austria	7 Jun 1950	
Bahamas	10 Jun 1976	
Belgium	13 Oct 1952	
Benin		4 Apr 1962 d
Cameroon		3 Nov 1961 d
Canada	4 May 1949	
Central African Republic		4 Sep 1962 d
Congo		15 Oct 1962 d
Côte d'Ivoire		8 Dec 1961 d
Cuba	4 Aug 1965	
Cyprus		16 May 1963 d
Czech Republic[2]	30 Dec 1993	
Denmark	1 Mar 1950	
Egypt	16 Sep 1949	
Fiji	12 Jun 1972	
Finland	31 Oct 1949	
France	5 May 1949	
Germany[3]	29 May 1973	
Ghana		7 Apr 1958 d
India	28 Dec 1949	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	30 Dec 1959	
Iraq	1 Jun 1949	
Ireland	19 Jul 1961	
Italy	13 Nov 1952	
Jamaica		17 Mar 1965 d
Luxembourg	14 Mar 1955	
Madagascar		9 Oct 1963 d
Malawi		10 Jun 1965 a
Mali		2 Feb 1973 d
Malta		24 Mar 1967 d
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 d
Mexico		21 Feb 1956 a
Montenegro[4]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		7 Nov 1956 d
Netherlands	26 Sep 1950	
Niger		25 Aug 1961 d
Norway	4 May 1949	
Pakistan	16 Jun 1952	
Senegal		2 May 1963 d
Serbia[5]		12 Mar 2001 d
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 d
Singapore		7 Jun 1966 a
Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993	
South Africa	14 Aug 1951	
Sri Lanka	14 Jul 1949	
Sweden	25 Feb 1952	
Switzerland	23 Sep 1949	

Participant[1]	*Definitive signature of the Protocol, Acceptance of the Protocol, Succession to the Convention and the Protocol*	*Accession to the Convention as amended by the Protocol(a), Succession to the Convention as amended by the Protocol(d)*
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 d
Turkey	13 Sep 1950	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[6]	4 May 1949	
United Republic of Tanzania		18 Mar 1963 a
Zambia		26 Mar 1973 d

Declarations and Reservations

[See the text of the declarations and reservations in respect of the unamended Convention (chapter VII.10) and the amending Protocol of 4 May 1949 (chapter VII.6).]

Notes:

[1] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[2] Czechoslovakia, by virtue of its acceptance of the Protocol of 4 May 1949 amending the Convention of 1910, became a party to the Convention on that same date. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] A notification of reapplication of the Convention of 4 May 1910 was received on 16 July 1974 from the Government of the German Democratic Republic. An instrument of acceptance of the amending Protocol of 4 May 1949 was deposited with the Secretary-General on the same date on behalf of the Government of the German Democratic Republic, the latter has been applying the Convention as amended since 16 July 1974. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] The former Yugoslavia had signed and accepted the Protocol on 4 May 1949 and 26 April 1951, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] On 6 and 10 June 1997, respectively, Secretary-General received communications regarding the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Agreement of 18 May 1904, the Convention of 4 May 1910 and the Protocol of 4 May 1949 amending both the Agreement and the Convention will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region

10. INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE WHITE SLAVE TRAFFIC

Paris, 4 May 1910

REGISTRATION: 5 July 1920, No. 8.[1]

Note: The Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others, concluded at Lake Success, New York of 21 March 1950 consolidates the Protocols, Conventions and Agreements listed in the present chapter under Nos. 1 to 10. Furthermore, the Convention of 21 March 1950 supercedes the provisions of the above-referenced instruments in the relations between the Parties thereto and shall terminate such instruments when all the Parties thereto shall have become Parties to the Convention of 21 March 1950, in accordance with its article 28.

The following list was provided by the Government of France at the time of the transfer to the Secretary-General of the depositary functions in respect of the Convention.

(1) States which ratified the Convention

Austria-Hungary
Belgium
Brazil
Denmark
France
Germany[2]
Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Italy
Netherlands
Portugal
Russia
Spain
Sweden

(2) States which acceded to the Convention

Bulgaria
Chile
China[3]
Colombia
Cuba
Czechoslovakia[4]
Egypt
Estonia
Finland
Irish Free State
Japan
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Monaco
Norway
Persia
Poland
Siam
Switzerland
Turkey
Uruguay
Yugoslavia (former)[5]

(3) The Convention was declared applicable to the following colonies, dominions and protectorates

French colonies, Morocco, Tunisia
Netherlands East and West Indies, Surinam and Curaçao
Canada
Union of South Africa
Newfoundland
New Zealand
Bahamas
Ceylon
Cyprus
Kenya
Fiji Islands
Gibraltar
Hong Kong[6]
Jamaica
Malta
Nyasaland
Southern Rhodesia
Straits Settlements
Trinidad
Australia
Papua and Norfolk
India
Barbados
British Honduras
Grenada
St. Lucia
St. Vincent
Seychelles
British Guiana
Isle of Man
Jersey
Guernsey

Mauritius
Leeward Islands
Falkland Islands
Gold Coast
Iraq
Gambia
Uganda
Tanganyika
Burma
New Guinea

Nauru
Sudan
Sierra Leone
Palestine and Transjordan
Sarawak
Gilbert and Ellice Islands
British Solomon Islands
Zanzibar

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[2]	*Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Bahamas	10 Jun 1976 d
Czech Republic[4]	30 Dec 1993 d
Fiji	12 Jun 1972 d
Lebanon	22 Sep 1949 a
Slovakia[4]	28 May 1993 d
Zimbabwe	1 Dec 1998 d

Notes:

[1] Great Britain, *Treaty Series* No. 20 (1912). This Convention is listed under No. 8 *a*) in the League of Nations *Treaty Series* and in the United Nations *Treaty Series* (Annex C).

[2] In a notification received on 16 July 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as from 10 August 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received on 2 March 1976 the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 17 June 1974, concerning the application, as from 10 August 1958, of the International Convention of 4 May 1910 for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, May 4th 1910 to which it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[4] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] On 6 and 10 June 1997, respectively, Secretary-General received communications regarding the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

11. a) Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others

Lake Success, New York, 21 March 1950

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 25 July 1951, in accordance with article 24.
REGISTRATION: 25 July 1951, No. 1342.
STATUS: Signatories: 25. Parties: 81.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 96, p. 271.

Note: The Convention was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 317 (IV)[1] of 2 December 1949.

Participant[2,3]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Afghanistan		21 May 1985 a
Albania		6 Nov 1958 a
Algeria		31 Oct 1963 a
Argentina		15 Nov 1957 a
Azerbaijan		16 Aug 1996 a
Bangladesh		11 Jan 1985 a
Belarus		24 Aug 1956 a
Belgium		22 Jun 1965 a
Benin	25 Sep 2003	
Bolivia		6 Oct 1983 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[4]		1 Sep 1993 d
Brazil	5 Oct 1951	12 Sep 1958
Bulgaria		18 Jan 1955 a
Burkina Faso		27 Aug 1962 a
Cambodia	27 Sep 2004	
Cameroon		19 Feb 1982 a
Central African Republic		29 Sep 1981 a
Congo		25 Aug 1977 a
Côte d'Ivoire		2 Nov 1999 a
Croatia[4]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba		4 Sep 1952 a
Cyprus		5 Oct 1983 a
Czech Republic[5]		30 Dec 1993 d
Denmark	12 Feb 1951	
Djibouti		21 Mar 1979 a
Ecuador	24 Mar 1950	3 Apr 1979
Egypt[6]		12 Jun 1959 a
Ethiopia		10 Sep 1981 a
Finland	27 Feb 1953	8 Jun 1972
France		19 Nov 1960 a
Ghana	24 Sep 2003	
Guatemala		13 Dec 2007 a
Guinea		26 Apr 1962 a
Haiti		26 Aug 1953 a
Honduras	13 Apr 1954	15 Jun 1993
Hungary		29 Sep 1955 a
India	9 May 1950	9 Jan 1953
Indonesia	25 Sep 2003	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 Jul 1953	
Iraq		22 Sep 1955 a
Israel		28 Dec 1950 a
Italy		18 Jan 1980 a
Japan		1 May 1958 a
Jordan		13 Apr 1976 a
Kazakhstan	17 Nov 2004	24 Jan 2006
Kuwait		20 Nov 1968 a
Kyrgyzstan		5 Sep 1997 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		14 Apr 1978 a
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 a
Lesotho	24 Sep 2003	24 Sep 2004
Liberia	21 Mar 1950	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		3 Dec 1956 a
Luxembourg	9 Oct 1950	5 Oct 1983
Madagascar	1 Oct 2001	
Malawi		13 Oct 1965 a
Mali		23 Dec 1964 a
Mauritania		6 Jun 1986 a
Mauritius	24 Sep 2003	
Mexico		21 Feb 1956 a
Micronesia (Federated States of)	23 Sep 2003	
Montenegro[7]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		17 Aug 1973 a

Participant[2,3]	Signature	Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)
Myanmar	14 Mar 1956	
Nepal		10 Dec 2002 a
Niger		10 Jun 1977 a
Nigeria	25 Sep 2003	
Norway		23 Jan 1952 a
Pakistan	21 Mar 1950	11 Jul 1952
Paraguay	26 Mar 2007	
Philippines	20 Dec 1950	19 Sep 1952
Poland		2 Jun 1952 a
Portugal[3]		30 Sep 1992 a
Republic of Korea		13 Feb 1962 a
Romania		15 Feb 1955 a
Russian Federation		11 Aug 1954 a
Rwanda		26 Sep 2003 a
Senegal		19 Jul 1979 a
Serbia[4]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		5 May 1992 a
Sierra Leone	26 Sep 2003	
Singapore		26 Oct 1966 a
Slovakia[5]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[4]		6 Jul 1992 d
South Africa	16 Oct 1950	10 Oct 1951
Spain		18 Jun 1962 a
Sri Lanka		15 Apr 1958 a
Syrian Arab Republic[6]		12 Jun 1959 a
Tajikistan		19 Oct 2001 a
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[4]		18 Jan 1994 d
Togo		14 Mar 1990 a
Ukraine		15 Nov 1954 a
Uzbekistan		27 Feb 2004 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		18 Dec 1968 a
Yemen[8]		6 Apr 1989 a
Zimbabwe		15 Nov 1995 a

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AFGHANISTAN

Reservation:

"Whereas, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan does not agree with the procedure of referring disputes arising between the Parties to the Convention relating to its interpretation of application, to the International Court of Justice, at the request of any one of the Parties to the dispute, therefore, it does not undertake any commitment regarding observation of article 22 of the present Convention."

ALBANIA

Declaration:

Thanks to the conditions created by the popular democratic régime in Albania, the offences covered by this Convention do not find favourable ground for development there, since the social conditions which give rise to such offences have been eliminated. Nevertheless, in view of the importance of the campaign against these offences in the countries where they still exist and the international importance of that campaign, the People's Republic of Albania has decided to accede to the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others adopted on 2 December 1949 at the fourth session of the United Nations General Assembly.

Reservation to article 22:

The People's Republic of Albania does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 which stipulates that any dispute between the parties to the Convention relating to its interpretation, application or execution shall, at the request of any one of the parties to the dispute, be referred to the International Court of Justice. The People's Republic of Albania declares that with respect to the competence of the International Court in that connexion, it will continue to maintain as in the past that for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision the agreement of all the parties to the dispute shall be necessary in each individual case.

ALGERIA

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, which provides for the compulsory competence of the International Court of Justice and declares that the agreement of all the parties to the dispute shall be necessary in each individual case for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision.

BELARUS[9,10,11]

BULGARIA[11]

Declaration:

The offences referred to in the Convention are unknown under the socialist régime of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, for the conditions favouring them have been eliminated. Nevertheless, since it is important to counteract these offences in the countries where they still exist, and since it is important to the international community that such action should be taken, the People's Republic of Bulgaria has decided to accede to the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others adopted by the fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on 2 December 1949.

ETHIOPIA

Reservation:

"Socialist Ethiopia does not consider itself bound by article 22 of the Convention."

FINLAND

Reservation to article 9:

"Finland reserves itself the right to leave the decision whether its citizens will or will not be prosecuted for a crime committed abroad to Finland's competent authority;"

FRANCE[12]

HUNGARY[10,11,13]

KAZAKHSTAN

Reservation:

The Republic of Kazakhstan will implement provisions of articles 1 and 18 of the Convention within the bounds of prevention and suppression of crimes and administrative offences provided by the Legislation of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

The Lao People's Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 which state that disputes between the Parties to the Convention relating to its interpretation or application shall, at the request of any one of the Parties to the dispute, be referred to the International Court of Justice. The Lao People's Democratic Republic declares that, with respect to the competence of the International Court concerning disputes relating to the interpretation and application of the Convention, for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice the agreement of all the parties to the dispute is necessary.

MALAWI

"The Government of Malawi accedes to this Convention with the exception of article 22 thereof, the effects of which are reserved."

ROMANIA[11,14]

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[9]

Declaration:

In the Soviet Union the social conditions which give rise to the offences covered by the Convention have been eliminated. Nevertheless, in view of the international importance of suppressing these offences, the Government of the Soviet Union has decided to accede to the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others adopted on 2 December 1949 at the fourth session of the United Nations General Assembly.

UKRAINE[9]

Declaration:

In the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic the social condi- tions which give rise to the offences covered by the Convention have been eliminated. Nevertheless, in view of the international importance of suppressing these offences, the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic has decided to accede to the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others adopted on 2 December 1949 at the fourth session of the United Nations General Assembly.

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Resolutions* (A/125 and Corr.1 and 2), p. 33.

[2] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 16 July 1974 with a reservation and a declaration. For the text of the reservation and declaration see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 943, p. 339. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] On 7 July 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General that the Convention would apply to Macao.

Subsequently, on 18 November and 3 December 1999, the Secretary-General received communications regarding the status of Macao from Portugal and China (see note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portgual" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[4] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 6 February 1951 and 26 April 1951, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 14 March 1958. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] Accession by the United Arab Republic. See also note 1 under "United Arab Republic" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] In communications received on 8 March 1989, 19 April 1989 and 20 April 1989, respectively, the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Belarus and Ukraine, notified the Secretary-General that they had decided to withdraw the reservations relating to article 22 made upon accession. For

the texts of the reservations see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 196, p. 349, vol. 1527 and vol. 201, p. 372, respectively.

[10] The Government of the Philippines informed the Secretary-General that it objects to the reservations made by the Governments of Belarus and Hungary because it feels that the reference to the International Court of Justice of any dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention should not be made dependent on the consent of all parties.

[11] In a communication received on 13 May 1955, the Government of Haiti informed the Secretary-General that it considers that in case of dispute it should be possible for either of the Contracting Parties concerned, without previous agreement between them, to refer a dispute to the International Court of Justice and that consequently it does not accept the reservation entered into by Bulgaria.

On that same date, the Government of South Africa informed the Secretary-General that it regards article 22 as fundamental to the Convention and cannot, therefore, accept the reservation entered into by Bulgaria.

Similar communications were received by the Secretary-General from the Governments of Haiti and South Africa in respect of the reservations made by the Governments of Belarus, Hungary and Romania.

On 24 June 1992, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 22 of the Convention made upon accession which reads as follows:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria declares, with respect to the competence of the International Court of Justice in disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention, that the consent of all the parties to the dispute is necessary in each particular case before any dispute whatsoever can be referred to the Court.

[12] On 11 March 2005, the Government of France informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its declaration made upon accession, which reads as follows:

The Government of the French Republic declares that, until further notice, this Convention will only be applicable to the metropolitan territory of the French Republic.

[13] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation relating to article 22 made upon accession. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 1427, p. 407.

[14] In a communication received on 2 April 1997, the Government of Romania notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation relating to article 22 made upon accession.

11. b) Final Protocol to the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others

Lake Success, New York, 21 March 1950

ENTRY INTO FORCE:	25 July 1951, in accordance with paragraph 2of the Protocol.
REGISTRATION:	25 July 1951, No. 1342.
STATUS:	Signatories: 26. Parties: 41.
TEXT:	United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 96, p. 316.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)*
Albania		6 Nov 1958 a
Argentina		1 Dec 1960 a
Azerbaijan		3 Dec 2004 a
Belarus[1]		24 Aug 1956 a
Belgium		22 Jun 1965 a
Benin	25 Sep 2003	
Brazil	5 Oct 1951	12 Sep 1958
Bulgaria		18 Jan 1955 a
Cambodia	27 Sep 2004	
Cuba		4 Sep 1952 a
Czech Republic[2]		30 Dec 1993 d
Denmark	12 Feb 1951	
Ecuador	24 Mar 1950	
Egypt[1,3]		12 Jun 1959 a
Finland	27 Feb 1953	
Ghana	24 Sep 2003	
Guatemala		13 Dec 2007 a
Guinea		26 Apr 1962 a
Haiti		26 Aug 1953 a
Honduras	13 Apr 1954	
India	9 May 1950	9 Jan 1953
Indonesia	25 Sep 2003	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 Jul 1953	
Israel		28 Dec 1950 a
Japan		1 May 1958 a
Kazakhstan	17 Nov 2004	5 Sep 2006
Kuwait		20 Nov 1968 a
Lesotho	24 Sep 2003	24 Sep 2004
Liberia	21 Mar 1950	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya[1]		3 Dec 1956 a
Luxembourg	9 Oct 1950	5 Oct 1983
Madagascar	1 Oct 2001	
Mali	24 Sep 2004	
Mauritius	24 Sep 2003	
Mexico[1]		21 Feb 1956 a
Micronesia (Federated States of)	23 Sep 2003	
Montenegro[4]		23 Oct 2006 d
Myanmar	14 Mar 1956	
Niger		10 Jun 1977 a
Nigeria	25 Sep 2003	
Norway		23 Jan 1952 a
Pakistan	21 Mar 1950	
Philippines	20 Dec 1950	19 Sep 1952
Poland		2 Jun 1952 a
Republic of Korea		13 Feb 1962 a
Romania		15 Feb 1955 a
Russian Federation		11 Aug 1954 a
Rwanda		26 Sep 2003 a
Senegal	24 Sep 2004	
Serbia[5]		12 Mar 2001 d
Sierra Leone	26 Sep 2003	
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 d
South Africa	16 Oct 1950	10 Oct 1951
Spain[1]		18 Jun 1962 a
Sri Lanka		7 Aug 1958 a
Syrian Arab Republic[1]		12 Jun 1959 a
Togo		14 Mar 1990 a
Ukraine		15 Nov 1954 a
Uzbekistan		27 Feb 2004 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		18 Dec 1968 a

Notes:

[1] In communications received on the dates indicated in parentheses, the Governments of the following States notified

the Secretary-General that their instruments of accession to the Convention also apply to the Final Protocol: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (15 November 1956); Libyan Arab Republic (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (7 January 1957); Mexico (16 April 1956); Spain (23 August 1962); United Arab Republic (Egypt) (Syrian Arab Republic) (20 October 1959).

[2] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Protocol on 14 March 1958. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Accession by the United Arab Republic. See also note 1 under "United Arab Republic" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume

[4] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Final Protocol on 6 February 1951 and 26 April 1951, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

(REFERENCE NUMBERS CORRESPOND TO CHAPTERS AND THEIR SUBDIVISIONS - SEE 'TABLE OF CONTENTS' AND FOOTER AT THE BOTTOM OF EACH PAGE)

A

ADMINISTRATION*: X.*12

AFRICA*: X.*, 2, 2.b*XXVII.*10

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES*: XIX.*, 10, 10.b, 10.d, 11, 15, 15.b, 18, 18.b, 25, 25.b, 25.d, 25.f, 25.h, 28.a, 30, 30.b, 33, 38, 40, 41.a, 5, 5.b, 5.d, 7, 9

AGRICULTURE*: PartII.*24*X.*8.a*XIX.*, 10, 10.b, 10.d, 18, 18.b, 33, 6

ANIMALS*: PartII.*, 23, 25

ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION*: PartII.*, 29, 7*XXII.*2

ARCHIVES*: III.*12

ARMS*: IV.*11.b*XXVI.*, 2.a, 2.c, 3

ASIA*: X.*, 11, 4*XIX.*, 11, 7*XXV.*, 2.a, 2.c, 3.a

ASSISTANCE*: III.*10*XIX.*, 28.b, 41.b

ASSOCIATIONS*: XIX.*16

AVIATION*: XI.A.*11

B

BASEL CONVENTION*: XXVII.*3

BIOLOGY*: XXVII.*8.a

C

CARIBBEAN*: IV.*14

CARTOGRAPHY*: XI.C.*3

CHARTERS-CONSTITUTIONS-STATUTES*: I.*, 1, 5.b*IX.*, 1, 1.b, 1.d, 1.f, 2*V.*1*X.*, 11.a, 2.b, 5, 8, 8.b*XII.*, 1, 1.b, 1.d, 1.f, 1.h*XIV.*, 7, 7.b*XIX.*17*XVIII.*10*XXI.*6.a*XXV.*, 2, 2.b, 3

CHEMICAL PRODUCTS*: XXVII.*14

CHILDREN-MINORS-YOUTH*: IV.*, 11, 11.b*VII.*1*XVIII.*12.a

CIVIL LAW*: XI.B.*30*XI.D.*1.a*XV.*2*XVI.*2*XX.*1

CIVIL MATTERS*: IV.*, 11, 11.c*XV.*, 1, 3

CLAIMS-DEBTS*: III.*12*XXVII.*16

COMMODITIES*: XI.A.*17*XIX.*, 10, 10.b, 10.d, 11, 14, 15.a, 16, 18, 18.b, 2, 21, 23, 25, 25.b, 25.d, 25.f, 25.h, 27, 28.b, 3, 30.a, 31, 33, 36, 38, 4, 40.a, 41.c, 43, 5, 5.b, 5.d, 7, 9

CONSTRUCTION*: XI.B.*7

CONTINENTAL SHELF CONVENTION*: XXI.*4

COOPERATION*: X.*14

COPYRIGHT*: XIV.*3*XXVIII.*1.a

CORRECTION (RIGHT OF)*: XVII.*1

CRIMINAL MATTERS*: IV.*, 1, 7, 9.b*PartII.*14.b*VI.*19*XII.*8*XVIII.*, 12, 12.b, 13, 15, 7*XXVII.*11

CULTURAL MATTERS*: XIV.*, 1, 3

CUSTOMS*: PartII.*16*X.*3*XI.A.*, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 3, 6, 8

D

DEVELOPING COUNTRIES*: X.*14

DEVELOPMENT*: X.*, 2, 8, 8.b

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR RELATIONS*: III.*, 3, 5, 7*XVIII.*7

DISARMAMENT*: XXIV.*2*XXVI.*, 2, 2.b, 2.d, 4

DISASTER RELIEF*: PartII.*26

DISEASES*: PartII.*23

DISPUTE SETTLEMENT*: II.*1*III.*8*XXI.*5

DROUGHT*: XXVII.*10

E

ECONOMIC COMMUNITY OF WEST AFRICAN STATES (ECOWAS)*: X.*5

ECONOMIC MATTERS*: XI.B.*8*XIII.*, 1, 3.a

EDUCATION*: XIV.*, 1, 3, 5

ENERGY*: XXVI.*4

ENGINEERING*: XIV.*, 7, 7.b

ENMOD CONVENTION (DISARMAMENT)*: XXVI.*1

ENVIRONMENT*: PartII.*17*XXI.*, 1, 3, 6, 7*XXVI.*, 1, 2.a, 2.c, 3*XXVII.*, 1, 11, 13, 13.b, 15, 1.a, 1.c, 1.e, 1.g, 2, 2.b, 2.d, 3, 3.b, 4.a, 4.c, 5.a, 6, 7.a, 8, 9

ESPOO CONVENTION (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT): *XXVII*.4

EUROPE: *XI.A*.12*XI.B*., 14.a, 21, 28*XI.C*.3*XI.E*.2

F

FAMILY MATTERS: *XVI*.2*XX*.1

FINANCE: *PartII*., 10, 12, 16, 9*X*., 13, 16, 2.a, 4

FISHING AND FISHERIES: *XXI*.3

FLORENCE AGREEMENT: *XIV*.2

FOOD: *XI.B*.17*XIX*., 28.b, 30.a, 41.b

FORESTRY: *XXVII*.10

FRONTIERS: *XI.A*.17*XI.C*.2*XXI*.4*XXVII*., 1.a, 1.c, 1.h, 4.a, 4.c, 5.a

G

GATT (GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE): *X*.1.a

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE (GATT): *X*.1.a

GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES: *X*.1.c

H

HAMBURG CONVENTION: *XI.D*.3

HAVANA CHARTER: *X*.1.b

HEALTH AND HEALTH SERVICES: *IV*.15*IX*., 1, 1.b, 1.d, 1.f, 2

HIGH SEAS CONVENTION: *XXI*.2

HIGH SEAS FISHING CONVENTION (LIVING RESOURCES:CONSERVATION): *XXI*.3

HUMAN RIGHTS: *IV*., 1, 11, 11.b, 12, 14, 15.a, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8.a, 9, 9.b*V*., 2, 4*VII*., 1, 11.a, 2, 4, 6, 8*XVI*., 1, 3*XVIII*., 1, 12.a, 2, 4

I

ICCPR (CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS): *IV*.4

ICESC (COVENANT ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS): *IV*.3

IMMIGRATION: *XVIII*.12.b

INDIGENOUS PEOPLES: *IV*.14

INDUSTRY: *X*.9

INFORMATION: *XXVII*., 13, 13.b

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE (ICJ): *I*.1

INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT (IFAD): *X*., 8, 8.b

INTERNATIONAL MARITIME ORGANIZATION (IMCO/IMO): *XII*., 1, 1.b, 1.d, 1.f, 1.h

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS-INSTITUTIONS: *PartII*.26*XIX*.16

J

JUDICIAL MATTERS: *XXVII*., 13, 13.b

L

LABOUR: *X*.10*XI.B*.26*XI.D*.2*XVIII*.8.a

LAND-LOCKED STATES: *X*.3

LATIN AMERICA: *IV*.14

LAW OF THE SEA: *XXI*., 1, 3, 5, 7, 9

LAW OF THE SEA CONVENTION: *XXI*.6

LAW OF TREATIES: *III*.12*XXIII*.2

LEGAL MATTERS: *I*., 1, 5.b*IV*.9*PartII*., 10, 12, 20, 8*V*.4*X*.10*XI.B*., 26, 30*XI.D*., 1.a, 2.a*XI.E*.1*XII*., 1.a, 1.c, 1.e, 1.g, 3*XVII*.1*XXI*.5*XXIII*.2

M

MARITIME MATTERS: *PartII*.31*XI.D*., 3, 6*XII*., 1, 1.b, 1.d, 1.f, 1.h*XXI*., 2, 5, 6.a*XXVII*.9

MARKETING: *XI.A*.5

MERCENARIES: *XVIII*.6

METALS: *XIX*.29

MILITARY MATTERS: *PartII*.5*X*.1.d

MISSIONS; SEE ALSO UNITED NATIONS MISSIONS-PEACEKEEPING: *III*.10

MONETARY MATTERS: *PartII*., 14.a, 15

MONTREAL PROTOCOL: *XXVII*., 2.a, 2.c

MOON TREATY: *XXIV*.2

MOTOR VEHICLES: *PartII*.21*XI.A*., 10, 3, 7*XI.B*., 10, 13, 16.1, 16.100, 16.102, 16.104, 16.106, 16.108, 16.11, 16.111, 16.113, 16.115, 16.117, 16.119, 16.120, 16.122, 16.124, 16.126, 16.13H, 16.15, 16.17, 16.19, 16.20, 16.22, 16.24, 16.26, 16.28, 16.3, 16.31, 16.33, 16.35, 16.37, 16.39, 16.40, 16.42, 16.44, 16.46, 16.48, 16.5, 16.51, 16.53, 16.55, 16.57, 16.59, 16.60, 16.62, 16.64, 16.66, 16.68, 16.7, 16.71, 16.73, 16.75, 16.77, 16.79, 16.80, 16.82, 16.84, 16.86, 16.88, 16.9, 16.91, 16.93, 16.95, 16.97, 16.99, 33

N

NARCOTICS*: VI.*, 1, 11, 12.b, 14, 16, 18, 2, 5, 6.b, 8.b

NATIONALITY*: III.*, 4, 8*PartII.5V.*4

NATURAL RESOURCES*: XXI.*3

NAVIGATION*: PartII.*, 17, 19*XI.A.*11*XI.D.*, 1, 2, 5*XII.*, 1, 1.b, 1.d, 1.f, 1.h, 3, 5, 8

NEUTRALITY*: PartII.*32

NUCLEAR MATTERS*: XVIII.*15

O

OUTER SPACE*: XXIV.*1

OZONE CONVENTION (VIENNA CONVENTION)*: XXVII.*2

P

PACIFIC*: X.*11*XXV.*, 2, 2.b, 3

PALERMO CONVENTION*: XVIII.*, 12, 12.b

PATENTS*: XIV.*4

PEACE*: PartII.*1

PENAL MATTERS*: XVIII.*, 1, 11, 12.a, 12.c, 14, 2, 4, 6, 8

POLLUTION*: XXVII.*, 1, 1.b, 1.d, 1.f, 1.h, 2.a, 2.c, 3, 3.b, 4.a, 4.c

POPULATION*: IV.*14

PORTS*: PartII.*20

POSTAL SERVICES*: PartII.*, 10, 12, 8*X.*12

PRIVILEGES-IMMUNITIES*: III.*, 1, 2, 2.10, 2.12, 2.12b, 2.14, 2.16, 2.18, 2.2a, 2.3, 2.5, 2.7, 2.7b, 2.8*XVIII.*13

PROPERTY MATTERS*: XIV.*4

PUBLICATIONS*: VIII.*, 1, 3, 5*XI.A.*5

R

RAILWAY*: XI.C.*5

REFUGEES*: PartII.2V.*, 1, 3, 5

ROADS*: PartII.*30*XI.A.*, 13, 3, 8*XI.B.*, 11, 11.b, 13, 14.a, 15, 2, 21, 24, 26, 27, 28.a, 30, 34, 5, 7, 8.c

ROME CONVENTION*: XIV.*3

ROME STATUTE*: XVIII.*10

S

SCIENCES*: XIV.*, 7, 7.b*XXVII.*, 2, 2.b, 2.e, 8, 9.a

SCIENTIFIC MATTERS*: XIV.*, 1, 5, 7.a, 7.c

SEA*: XXI.*, 1, 3, 5, 7, 9*XXVII.*9.a

SECURITY*: XVIII.*8

SHIPS AND SHIPPING*: PartII.*28*XI.B.*30*XI.D.*, 1.a, 6*XII.*5

SOUTHEAST ASIA*: XIX.*17

SPECIALIZED AGENCIES; SEE ALSO NAMES OF AGENCIES*: III.*, 2.1, 2.11, 2.12a, 2.13, 2.15, 2.17, 2.2a, 2.3, 2.5, 2.7, 2.7b, 2.8

SPORTS*: IV.*10

STATISTICS*: XIII.*, 1, 3.a

T

TAXATION*: PartII.*, 12, 21*XI.B.*13*XXVIII.*1.b

TELECOMMUNICATIONS*: PartII.*1*XXIV.*1*XXV.*, 2, 2.b, 3, 4

TERRITORIAL SEA-CONTIGUOUS ZONE CONVENTION*: XXI.*1

TERRORISM*: XVIII.*, 11, 5, 7

TIR CONVENTION (CUSTOMS CONVENTION)*: XI.A.*16

TOURISM*: PartII.*16*XI.A.*, 2, 4, 7

TRADE*: PartII.*25*X.*, 10, 1.a, 1.c, 3, 7.a*XI.A.*, 10, 6, 8*XIV.*5*XIX.*, 10.a, 10.c, 10.e, 13, 15, 15.b, 18.a, 21, 25, 25.b, 25.d, 25.f, 25.h, 28.a, 39, 41, 41.c, 5, 5.b, 5.d, 8*XXII.*1*XXVII.*11

TRADE LAW*: X.*, 10, 7.a

TRANSPORT*: PartII.*16*X.*3*XI.A.*, 12, 14, 16, 2, 4, 9*XI.B.*, 11, 11.b, 13, 14.a, 17, 19, 20, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28.a, 3, 31, 32, 4, 6, 8, 9*XI.C.*, 2, 4, 6*XI.D.*, 1.a, 2.a, 6*XI.E.*, 1, 2.a

TREATIES-AGREEMENTS (APPLICATION)*: XXIII.*, 1, 3

U

UNITED NATIONS (UN)*: I.*, 1, 5.b*III.*1*XVIII.*8

UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION (UNIDO)*: X.*9

W

WAR: *IV*.11.b

WATERCOURSES-WATER RESOURCES: *PartII*.17*XI.D*.2*XXVII*., 16, 5.a, 9

WILDLIFE (PROTECTION): *XXVII*.11

WOMEN: *IV*., 8, 8.b*VII*., 2, 5*XVI*.2*XVIII*.12.a

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION (WHO): *IX*., 1, 1.b, 1.d, 1.f, 2

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى: الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

USD $ 115.00
ISBN 978-92-1-133662-7

Printed at the United Nations, New York
United Nations Publications
Sales No. E.09.V.3
35440 May 2009 – 600
ST/LEG/SER.E/26 (Vol. I)